

hph.  
iol.

Wiggins

THE GUNHILDA LETTERS.

# MARRIAGE

WITH A

**D**eceased Wife's Sister:



LETTERS OF A LADY

(Mrs E. Stone Wiggins, Ottawa)

TO

THE RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

*by*  
*Evangelina Gunhilda Wiggins (Mrs E. Stone Wiggins)*

Price, - - - 20 Cents.

Ottawa, Canada :

Printed at the Office of the Daily Citizen, 31 Metcalfe Street.

1881.



THE GUNHILDA LETTERS.

---

MARRIAGE

WITH A

DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

---

LETTERS OF A LADY

TO THE


RIGHT REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

---

OTTAWA, CANADA :

PRINTED AT THE OFFICE OF THE DAILY CITIZEN, METCALFE STREET.

1881.



COPYRIGHT SECURED.

DEDICATION.

---

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE

Senate and of the House of Commons,

WHOSE NAMES ARE ATTACHED, AND WHO SUPPORTED

MR. GIROUARD'S BILL,

THESE LETTERS ARE RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED.

## MEMBERS OF THE SENATE

WHO VOTED AGAINST THE AMENDMENT TO DEFER THE BILL.

Aikins, Baillargeon, Benson, Botsford, Boyd, Cochrane, Dever, Fabre, Ferguson, Ferrier, Flint, Gibbs, Hamilton (Inkerman), Hamilton (Kingston), Hope, Leonard, Lewin, McMaster, Macfarlane, Macpherson (Speaker), Montgomery, Pâquet, Pelletier, Penny, Price, Read, Reesor, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Thibaudeau—Nays, 31 ; Yeas, 33.

---

## MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

WHO VOTED AGAINST THE AMENDMENT OF MR. JONES THAT THE BILL BE  
“ TAKEN INTO CONSIDERATION THIS DAY SIX MONTHS.”

Abbott, Allison, Angers, Anglin, Arkell, Baby, Beauchesne, Béchard, Benoit, Bergeron, Bill, Blake, Bolduc, Bourassa, Brown, Bunster, Burnham, Burpee (Sunbury), Cameron (Huron), Cameron (Victoria), Carling, Caron, Cartwright, Casey, Cimon, Cockburn (Muskoka), Colby, Costigan, Coupal, Coursol, Currier, Daoust, DeCosmos, Desjardins, Dugas, Dumont, Ellicott, Fiset, Fitzsimmons, Fortin, Gigault, Gillies, Girouard (Jacques Cartier), Grandbois, Gunn, Hackett, Haggart, Hay, Hesson, Hilliard, Hooper, Huntington, Hurteau, Ives, Jackson, Killam, King, Kranz, Landry, LaRue, Longley, McDonald (Pictou), Macdonell (Lanark), Mackenzie, Macmillan, McCallum, McDougall, McGreevy, McInnes, McLennan, McRory, Malouin, Massue, Merner, Méthot, Mousseau, Muttart, Ogden, Oliver, Orton, Ouimet, Paterson (Brant), Perrault, Pinsonneault, Poupore, Rinfret, Robertson (Shelburne), Rochester, Rogers, Ross (Dundas), Ross (Middlesex), Routhier, Royal, Ryan (Montreal), Rykert, Sriver, Shaw, Skinner, Smith (Selkirk), Strange, Tellier, Thompson (Cariboo), Vallée, Wallace (Norfolk), White (Cardwell), White (Hastings), Wright and Yeo—Nays, 103 ; Yeas, 34.

## EDITOR'S PREFACE.

---

**D**URING the Parliamentary session in the winter of 1881, D. Girouard, Esq., M.P. for Jacques Cartier, brought down a bill to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The Roman Catholic members were willing, in fact anxious, that it should pass; for, although such marriages are not permitted in the Roman Catholic Church except by dispensation, it has always been a complaint in Canada, as in England, that their dispensations were thwarted by the civil laws. The Protestant dissenters were also anxious for the passage of the bill, for, disbelieving the doctrine of the Roman Catholic and High Church that union by religious ceremony creates connection by blood, and finding no Scripture to justify such a prohibition, they were desirous of abolishing every unnecessary restriction to marriage, as well as to remove a social grievance and legal disability from the numerous families—many of the highest respectability and social standing—in which such marriages had been contracted.

Under such circumstances, while the great body of the people were not only favourable to the measure but absolutely ridiculed the idea that such a prohibition should exist in Canadian law, it may seem strange that Mr. Girouard's bill, after having been carried by a large majority in the Commons, should have been defeated in the Senate. This result was brought about by the official and social exertions of the Right Rev. J. Travers Lewis, D.D., LL.D., Lord Bishop of Ontario.

His Lordship's efforts, and those of his clergy, to flood Parliament with petitions from all parts of the country, as well as his pleadings with certain members of the Senate, would have done him credit in any cause involving the real welfare of the people. Making himself, however, the head and front in a struggle in itself purely secular, he fairly became the object of so powerful an assailant as the authoress of the *GUNHILDA LETTERS*. These were published during the session of 1881 in the *Ottawa Citizen*, and certain it is that no communications in a public newspaper have ever awakened a greater interest among women as well as men, or produced a more profound impression on the public mind, both in Canada and the United Kingdom.





## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

---

A LADY'S LETTERS TO THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

“As no acquisition is more to be esteemed than peace, when it leaves us in possession of our honour and lawful rights, so, on the other hand, whenever it is joined with loss of freedom or with infamy nothing can be more detestable and fatal.”—*Polybius*.

### LETTER I.

MY LORD BISHOP,—The Bill brought before Parliament last session by the member for Jacques Cartier to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister, though passed by a large majority in the Commons, was, I am credibly informed, mainly by your personal and clerical influence—an influence which your position as ecclesiastical head of this section of our church secures you, and the consequent freedom with which you move in the circle that surrounds the court and the throne—defeated in the Senate. With the prospect that it will be again before the Commons, Your Lordship again hovers upon the horizon, not alone, however, as before, but with a great company, to secure the extinction of any liberty that may be accorded to women. I am, My Lord, a plain, unlettered woman, while you, I believe, enjoy a classic and finished education. But before I shall have done with you it may appear that if the position you have assumed is not unclerical it is at all events unscriptural, anti-Christian and ungenerous.

In all ages of the world society has suffered from the encroachments of the ecclesiastical on the civil prerogative; and the period when slavery, both physical and mental, and the humiliation and debasement of mankind were the most general and complete was when the church may be said to have gained universal empire. Two beings were then the special objects of contempt in the eyes of priest and bishop—the philosopher who declared that the earth was round and she who is accused of having induced our first male parent to taste of the forbidden tree. It is this period Your Lordship can look back with pride to as having endowed you with those civil but papal insignia, the staff and the ring, which on great occasions Your Lordship still flourishes, to the delight of the high church party in Canada. Dr. Mosheim, a Protestant divine, and the most accurate and careful ecclesiastical historian since apostolic times, says, in his *History of the Eleventh Century*, that “it had long been customary with the emperors, kings and princes of Europe to

confer the larger benefices and the government of monasteries by the delivery of a ring and a staff.”—(Ecc. His., vol. ii, p. 324.) How striking the contrast between this display of kingly power with the modest and humble pretensions of the first successors of the apostles! “In the first century and the next,” says this historian, “a bishop had charge of a single church, which might ordinarily be contained in a private house; nor was he its lord, but in reality its minister and servant—instructing the people, conducting all parts of public worship and attending on the sick and necessitous in person.”—(Ecc. His., vol. i, p. 91.) The church did not then attempt to enact laws to restrict the liberties of the people, either as to marriage or other matters the control of which has at a comparatively recent date been usurped by the priesthood, for these were regulated entirely by the uncontrolled will of the emperor. “Supreme power over the whole sacred order,” says Mosheim, “and over all the possessions of the church was, both in the East and in the West, vested in the emperors and kings. The emperors of the Franks inquired into the lives and conduct of all priests, superior and inferior, enacted laws respecting the mode of worshipping God, punished priestly delinquencies of every kind just as those of other citizens, and the decrees of a council could not have the force of laws unless confirmed and ratified by the reigning sovereign.”—(Ecc. His., vol. ii, p. 188, eighth century.) But the influence and dignity enjoyed by the priests of the neighbouring barbarians were too much for the Christianity of the early bishops, who, instead of remaining under the control of the people who supported them, now plotted to enjoy the authority and emolument of their barbarian neighbours. To effect this purpose they had recourse to a council of bishops—a means by which the church has since not only seized upon the revenue of all civilized nations, but has well nigh despoiled the people of every liberty and privilege they enjoyed in the first ages of Christianity. To this day even the Protestant bishop is a lord of the soil in the mother country, and though in Canada he no longer enjoys a controlling influence with the civil power still he manages through the instruments his spiritual progenitors have placed into his hands to obtain a livelihood of the most desirable kind without work. But it was not the fault of the bishops of George the Third’s time that Your Lordship is not now a *de facto* secular potentate, for, sitting in the House of Peers and influencing to a great degree, as they do now, the will of the sovereign, they were sufficiently powerful to extend Jewish law—so delightful to Your Lordship—to Canada, and to secure a reserve known as the Clergy Reserve—one-seventh of all our lands—for the support of the Established Church; and so content were the political leaders of the day that even William Lyon Mackenzie endorsed this policy of the home government.\*

“These councils,” says Mosheim, “of which no vestige appears before the middle of the second century, changed nearly the whole form of the church; for, in the first place, the ancient rights and privileges of the people were by them very much abridged; and, on the other hand, the authority and dignity of the bishops were not a little augmented. At first they did not deny themselves to be the representatives of their churches, and guided by instruction from the people; but gradually they made higher pretensions, maintaining that power was given them by Christ himself to decide upon rules of faith and conduct for the members of his church. In the next place, the perfect

---

\*In no part of the constitution of the Canadas is the wisdom of the British legislature more apparent than in setting apart a portion of the country, while yet it remained a wilderness, for the support of religion—*Life of William Lyon Mackenzie*, vol. i, p. 44.

equality and parity of all bishops which existed in the early times these councils by degrees destroyed.”—(Mosheim, Ecc. His., vol. i, p. 161.) It is plain, therefore, that it was never intended by the founders of Christianity that the successors of the apostles should in any way interfere with individuals in matters pertaining to citizenship; nor need it astonish us that this wicked contravention of Christian principles, when the apostles had been little more than a century in their graves—and by which, as I will show, woman for seventeen centuries has suffered civil and religious martyrdom—should culminate, not only in the church seizing the secular power of all civilized nations, but in erecting a papacy whose object was to bind in fetters the bodies and souls of all mankind.

But, having gained the coveted pinnacle of power, the next step was to tax the people that the church revenue might enable the bishops and the clergy to live in the luxury and affluence which became their high dignity and office. But how was this to be done without the people's consent? The task was easy. All that was necessary was to imitate the tricks of the sacerdotal orders of the heathen—deceive them. Instead of declaring themselves the successors of Christ and his apostles, say, with Your Lordship, that they are the successors of Aaron in the line of the Jewish priesthood, and a tenth of the produce of all the land is theirs. Thus arose, My Lord, the *tithe system*, which has subsisted in the church—even the Church of England—to our own day, which is now driving the young men of Quebec to seek a home in a foreign country, and which our high church bishops are constantly urging should prevail among Church of England people in the Dominion; the system that has driven the sons of Ireland to spread their hands towards almost every country under heaven, that they might find an humble resting place free from the galling taxation of the Protestant bishop, which will cover the proud name of England with shame for a hundred generations. “No small honour and profit,” says Mosheim, “accrued to the whole order of the clergy who conducted the affairs of the church from the time they succeeded in persuading the people to regard them as successors of the Jewish priests. This took place not long after the reign of Adrian, (A.D. 80), when, upon the second destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews lost all hope of seeing their commonwealth restored. The bishops now wished to be thought to correspond with the high priest of the Jews, and, among other errors resulting from it, it established a wider difference between the teacher and the learners than accords with the nature of the Christian religion. \* \* \* This comparison of Christian teachers with the Jewish priesthood led the former to lay claim to *tithes* and *first fruits*, of which we find mention before the time of Constantine (A. D. 325). Perhaps the desire to increase their revenues, which were both small and precarious, led some of the bishops to apply Jewish law to the Christian church. That they claimed first fruits *as a divine right* in this (second) century is clear from Irenæus, *contra Hæres*. Tithes had been commonly paid among pagans from time immemorial. Their origin, therefore, is not to be sought in the Mosaic dispensation, but in that patriarchal faith which is at the bottom of every religious system.”—(Ecc. His., p. 161 and note.)

But even after the people had consented to regard the Christian bishops as the successors of Aaron, and admit their claim to all the emoluments and powers prescribed to the Jewish priesthood by the Mosaic law, it was found that the prevailing desire to become pecuniarily independent would prevent them from granting that liberal support to the church which their early lordships desired. The whole tide of the church's energy, therefore, was turned towards destroying in the people the desire of gain—towards persuad-



ing them that man, though primordially made in the image of the Creator, had by his primitive rebellion—induced to it by a woman—become the most despicable of creative objects ; that he not only merited eternal punishment, but was spared its infliction by the mere moment-giving mercy of God, and that of all the agents of Satan the most liable to debar him from heaven was *money* ! True, it would be generations, and perhaps ages, before the doctrine of total depravity would bear fruit, but the fear of going to dwell forever with the rich man—of having to gain paradise by a feat more difficult than drawing a camel through a needle's eye—had the immediate effect in that superstitious age of rendering money and riches in general as the most abhorrent foe of mankind. The gates of paradise, the walls and pavements of the New Jerusalem, were represented as of precious stones and of gold—of course the gifts of the pious in all ages from the days of Abraham, as were the golden candlesticks, the ark of the covenant, and the sacred vessels used by the Jewish priests during the sovereignty of the Mosaic dispensation. Instead of being regarded as symbols of the purity and glory of the heavenly kingdom, they were interpreted in a literal sense, giving the Christian bishops the privilege exercised by the Druidical priests among the ancient Britons of borrowing money on the promise to pay in the next world. Thus, My Lord, was established that golden ladder which fifteen centuries afterwards mounted up to that monstrous doctrine which led to the sale of indulgences by Urban II and Leo X, that money, so long announced as the most perfidious enemy of the Christian religion, is the favourite means by which God's vicegerent on earth can extricate souls from the limbo of future punishment ! Here also originated the doctrine of commutation—which signifies changing one thing for another, as the punishment of sin for money—a doctrine that existed in the Church of England so late as the landing of our loyalist fathers in this country, and which I believe is still in existence. One of the twenty-eight grievances complained of to the House of Commons in the year 1648, over a hundred years after the Reformation, was “the general abuse of excommunication, which was inflicted for trivial matters, and the absolution thereof could not be obtained without money.”—(Rapin, vol. ii, p. 361.) Excommunication in England is a matter much more serious than when a priest or deacon in Canada is excommunicated by Your Lordship for receiving the eucharist in a Presbyterian church ; for after forty days a *significavit* is issued to the Court of Chancery—at least it was so in the reign of Charles I—which forthwith issues a writ *de excommunicato capendo*, when the person is thrown into prison by the civil powers, “where he may lie for many years,” says Rev. Mr. Madan, “if he has not money enough to purchase his letters of absolution.”

It is easy to perceive the consequences of such a course on the part of the religious teachers of that benighted age. Money which should have been employed to carry on the commerce of the country everywhere left its natural channels and flowed into the coffers of the church ; expensive places of worship rose in almost every village and town among the low, poverty stricken houses, so well represented in too many provinces of the Canadian Dominion. Show me a people, My Lord, who regard money as the great enemy of our race, when, next to an honourable life, it is the most desirable of earthly objects, as even our bishops, by their actions if not by their professions, testify, and I will show you a people ignorant, cowardly and poor, behind the times in invention, art, manufacture and learning, physically and mentally enslaved, and who, having been taught to despise themselves, and the only means by which life can be made respectable, if not endurable—to lean upon their spiritual advisers instead of relying upon themselves—are little less

than a nation of beggars! Charity, in the highest sense of the term, can have no existence in such a community, for where gifts are merely regarded as lawful dues the faculty of benevolence must cease to be. True, we frequently meet with people who affect to despise the ordinary means of earning money, "measuring tape and molasses," as they modestly express it, but they forget that it is to "measuring tape and molasses" that England to-day owes not only her wealth and commercial independence, but her high moral and liberal standing among the nations of the world. Napoleon the First wisely perceived this when he spoke of the English people as a "nation of shopkeepers," and so did our Edward III, who gained for himself the soubriquet of "the royal wool merchant." "A people," says John Stuart Mill, "has sometimes become free because it had first become wealthy." "Neither will it be," says Lord Bacon, "that a people overlaid with taxes should ever become valiant and martial. No people overcharged with tribute is fit for empire."

It is easy to picture to one's self the condition of man in the early Christian age, when the great body of the people were as ignorant as the horse they drove, but who could depict the condition of woman—with a husband taught to see no virtue in humanity, that woman was the cause of all the evil in the world, who was opposed to commerce, for his suspicion of his fellows would render business impossible, an accusation frequently made against Roman Catholic countries; to take no thought for the morrow, and, like the Digger Indian or the half breed on the Western plains, content with a bare existence; his wife a slave, and having none of the martial spirit of the American aborigine, for only a coward will beat his wife, ready at the slightest provocation to inflict upon her corporal punishment? No wonder woman in that age cheerfully surrendered a world that had nothing for her but poverty and degradation to drag out the rigorous experience of monastic life.

So early as the year 360 the Council of Bishops at Laodicea enacted canon 44, that "women ought not to come near the altar," and in the year 400 the Council of Toledo, canon 17, permitted a man to have one woman who was not his wife; the Council of Orleans, A.D. 533, enacted canon 18, that "the deacon's blessing shall no more be given to women," and in the sixth century so contemptible had woman become by the preaching of Christian bishops that she was not even permitted to approach the altar, or to touch the pall that covered it, unless when by the priest it was delivered her to be washed! The eucharist was too holy to be vitiated by her naked hand, and she was therefore ordered by the canons of the church to put a white linen glove upon her hand to receive it.—(Alexander's History of Women, vol. i, p. 166.) Even in the second century, Athenagoras, in his apology for the Christians, says, "the devils were ruined by the love that they bore unto women."—(Du Pin, vol. i, p. 56.) But woman was not yet totally deprived of protection and mental liberty, which nature itself had enabled her to look for to a certain degree in her children. But even that avenue was to be closed, and, to make her captivity complete in heart and person, in body and soul, the clergy taught that the mother is not related to her child. Among the ancient barbarians parents sometimes married their children from this belief, which is mentioned by Æschylus, for he makes Orestes plead before the gods that he is not of kin to his mother. This was the belief of the Jews and the New Testament writers. In the genealogy of Christ we observe that whether we trace by the mother's or supposed father's side he is a descendant of Bathsheba, wife of Uriah, whom David married when he already pos-

sessed several wives ; so that if the mother be regarded as a relative of the child Christ might be considered illegitimate in his royal descent from David. This accounts for the fact that the sons of Jacob by his women who were not his wives, Bilhah and Zilpah, inhabited the land of Canaan equally with the children of his wives, Leah and Rachel.—(Gen. xxxv, 25.) Through the influence of Pagan and Jewish priests in the Church of England this doctrine has been incorporated into British law and the statutes of the Dominion. In England it was decided in the courts that the Duke of Suffolk's wife was not of kin to her son, and for this reason the mother is not in law permitted to be the guardian of her own children, a statute of which Senator Trudel, one of the opponents of the Bill to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister, naturally enough took advantage a few months ago at Montreal.\* It is a matter of no difficulty to count the domestic tyrants that sit in the Canadian Senate.

The evident object of all this was to accumulate endless wealth into the hands of the priests, and to put woman completely into their power. Cyrus the Great and the greater Alexander, each of whom had conquered a world, were deified after death—a courtesy to which Your Lordship is in no way liable—on account of their sympathy and gallantry to woman.

"Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,  
Where wealth accumulates and men decay ;  
Princes and lords may flourish or may fade,  
A breath can make them, as a breath has made,  
But a bold peasantry, their country's pride,  
When once destroyed can never be supplied."

GUNHILDA.

---

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

---

### A LADY'S LETTERS TO THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

"To alienate even our own rights would be a crime as much more enormous than suicide as a life of civil security and freedom is superior to a bare existence. And if life be the bounty of heaven we scornfully reject the noblest part of the gift if we consent to surrender that certain rule of living without which the condition of human nature is not only miserable but contemptible."  
—*Letters of Junius.*

#### LETTER II.

MY LORD BISHOP,—How sad the consequences arising from the first step into evil ! No sooner had the bishops of the first and second centuries arrogated to themselves the powers heretofore enjoyed by the Levitical priesthood than they ran into excesses so shocking in their nature as to demand the most vigorous efforts to successfully conceal them, except, indeed, from the penetrating eye of the historian ; and when it is considered that the history of the Christian church in those days was in a great measure shaped by the clergy themselves it is perhaps matter for surprise that any evidence whatever

---

\*The action brought by Mrs. Trudel against her husband, Hon. Mr. Trudel, for separation, has been dismissed by Mr. Justice Papineau. Her petition to be allowed to raise money on her own property and to visit her children was also rejected.—*Quebec Chronicle, January 1st, 1881.*



as to the true inwardness of their lives, notwithstanding the forgeries of which I am yet to speak, was ever permitted to descend to us.

It was now discovered that a tenth of the earnings of the primitive Christians was insufficient to meet the requirements of the ecclesiastics; accordingly it was resolved to make concessions to the surrounding heathen, to induce them to embrace Christianity and contribute to the funds of the church. "There is good reason to suppose," says Mosheim, "that Christian bishops (in the second century) multiplied sacred rites for the sake of rendering the Jews and pagans more friendly to them."—(Ecc. His., p. 180, second century). The oppressive taxation to which these people were subjected is almost beyond credibility; and so late as the eleventh century we find that "among the Prussian and other nations, while many had embraced Christianity, on account of the numberless taxes laid upon them, especially by the clergy, they again returned to paganism."—(Mosheim Ecc. History p. 297, eleventh century.) This new acquisition to the Christian fold enabled the bishops to enact the same superstitious practices to extort money as was pursued by the Pagan priests themselves; so we find that before the close of the first century, and while the Apostle John was yet living, "many with great veneration kept figures of Christ and his apostles in their houses."—(Mosheim Ecc. His. p. 60, first century.) "Rumours" says this historian "were artfully disseminated of prodigies and wonders seen in certain edifices and places, a trick before this time practised by the pagan priests, whereby the infatuated populace were drawn together, and the stupidity and ignorance of those who looked upon everything new and unusual as a miracle, were often wretchedly imposed upon. Graves of saints and martyrs were supposed to be where they were not; the list of saints was enriched with fictitious names, and even robbers were converted into martyrs. Some buried blood-stained bones in retired places, and then gave out that they had been informed in a dream that the corpse of some friend of God was there interred. Many, especially of the monks, travelled through the different provinces, and not only shamelessly carried on a traffic in fictitious relics, but also deceived the eyes of the multitude by inventing combats with evil spirits."—(Mosheim Ecc. His., p. 957, fourth century.) Even St. Augustine, from whom Your Lordship claims apostolic descent was one of the chief promoters of this system to raise money for the support of the church. He enumerates about seventy miracles performed by the relics of St. Stephen, three of which were resurrections from the dead; all in the space of two years, and within the limits of his own diocese. Synesius, one of the early Christian bishops, A.D. 400, says: "As darkness is most proper and commodious for those who have weak eyes, so I hold that lies and fiction are useful to the people, and that truth would be hurtful to those who are not able to bear its light and splendor."—(Leland, vol. xxi, p. 344.) To justify this method of ecclesiastical government, the bishops had no hesitation, as I will show, in forging passages of Scripture to represent the Creator in the same character as themselves, so that it need no longer excite surprise that women are daily deceived and ruined by men when they only adopt the same method as the Deity in accomplishing His purposes. To deceive and destroy Ahab, King of Israel, He "put a lying spirit in the mouth of all His prophets,"—(1 Kings, xxii, 22). So He is represented as saying, "If the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing I, the Lord, have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel" (Ezek. xiv, 9.) Synesius lived in the fourth century, at a period when the church is generally supposed to have enjoyed its original purity, and two

hundred years before the election of the Roman prelate as universal bishop. We are disposed to smile at the miraculous manifestations seen in Ireland, while I now write, as the outcome of wicked fraud on the part of the Irish Catholic clergy, and the solemn parade this year of saints' bones—or rather the cast of them—through the Canadian capital, for the purpose of obtaining money, but how few Canadian Protestants are aware that these same means of defrauding the people were employed by the most orthodox of the early bishops, and by the almost immediate successors of the apostles themselves? It is true, My Lord, that the Church of England clergy have recently schooled the people to believe all this a mere Popish innovation, and that when the Church of England sprang into being, the fountain of the Christian religion was wholly pure; but this assertion, like the doctrine propounded by the bishops of the second century has no foundation in fact. To avoid being responsible for the enormities of the Church of Rome for several centuries, and immediately before, as well as after the Reformation, they have taken upon themselves to declare that the Church of England, so far from being an offshoot of the papal church, was founded by Joseph of Aramithea, Simon Zelotes, Aristobulus, and even the Apostle Paul, as they affect to infer, from Clemens Romanus' first letter to the Corinthians, but "those stories," says Mosheim, "are too recent, and unsubstantial to be received by any inquisitive lover of the truth."—(Ecc. His. p. 58.) But even if a church had been established among the savage Britons, it exerted no influence upon the pagan Saxons who afterwards landed in their country, and from whom the English people—if we except the Normans and Danes who subsequently settled in England—are descended. The Church of England, My Lord, was founded by a woman, Bertha, the Queen of Ethelbert, the Kentish King, by whose influence the Saxons were converted to Christianity (Mosheim Ecc. History, p. 268), so that it well becomes our noble Queen to be saluted as the head of the Church, and for Your Lordship to pray for her as Queen Defender of the Faith. The same is true of the Christian Church in France, for "King Clovis, founder of the French monarchy," says Fullon, "was converted to Christianity by his wife, the beautiful and devout Clotilda, Princess of Burgundy."—(Hist. of Women, p. 261.) Your Lordship takes great pride in reminding us that our clergy trace their ecclesiastical descent to St. Augustine, and from him to the Apostle John—Archbishop Tait, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, being the one hundred and twenty-fifth indirect order from that apostle—but you have never pointed out that this, the most illustrious of the Christian bishops since apostolic times, owed all his greatness to Monica, his noble mother. Neander says that Gregory Nazianzen, John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople (A.D. 397), Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, (A.D. 325), and Augustine, Bishop of Hippo (A.D. 400), to whom, perhaps, the Christian church owes its very existence, "were all indebted to early maternal care for most of their future eminence."—(Hist. Christianity, Vol. 3, p. 321.) You rejoice, my Lord, that the Reformation freed the English Church from the dominancy of Rome, but you forget—if, indeed, you ever knew—that this event merely exchanged an Italian Pope for an English one, and that the Church of England would have remained a papacy to this day had it not been for the providential interposition of a woman. Dr. Mosheim declares that Henry the Eighth "understood the title he had assumed of supreme head of the British church as investing him with the Roman pontiff's power, so that he had a right to make decrees respecting religion, and to prescribe to his people what they must believe and practice. An act was passed in this



reign making the penalty burning for denying transubstantiation. It adjudged to death as felons all who maintained the necessity of communicating in both kinds or who attacked private masses or auricular confession. During Henry's whole reign the church remained in appearance completely Romish."—(Vol. 3, pp. 149-172.) "Henry VIII.," says Father Maguire, a Roman Catholic, in his discussion with Mr. Pope, "thought it safest to die in the Catholic Church;" and it is well known that he left large sums of money to pay for masses which he had directed to be said for his soul. Protestants and Catholics knew but one church, and attended no other till the tenth year of Elizabeth's reign. There is nothing to be gained, My Lord—though the clergy have ever been slow to believe it—by literary dishonesty; but be it known to you that for years after the separation from Rome the Church of England, was as completely papal as the papacy itself. The Church of England, in the reign of Henry the Eighth, not only continued commutations—another form of indulgences—the worship of the Virgin, and forbade the clergy, on pain of death, to marry, but, as a natural sequence, actually attempted to establish nunneries on the same plan as the parent church—which the High Church bishops of England and of Canada would to-day establish if they had the power—they having already erected the confessional—and from the disgrace of which the nation was saved by the timely accession of a woman to the throne. Englishmen have submitted only by force to the condition of being ruled by a woman, as any tampering with the line of succession would be certain to repeat the wars of the Roses. Strange, however, but true—and to the mortification of Englishwomen—the same nation which permits a woman to wear her diadem, gives the patrimony to the eldest son, and with a heart unfeeling as iron turns the daughters into the street, through the law of primogeniture. It would be well if women only were permitted to sway the English sceptre, for England never so prospered at home or abroad—in art, agriculture, commerce, refinement and learning—as under her queens. Not a traitor was executed in Anne's reign!

But while the English people were willing that a woman should wear the English crown, they were not willing—having been so long tutored by the Romish Church—that she should act as Sovereign Pontiff, though a woman (Pope John, who succeeded Leo the Fourth) had occupied the chair of St. Peter, "nor did any one," says Mosheim, "regard the thing, prior to the Reformation, either incredible or disgraceful to the Church.—(Vol. 2, p. 184, Ninth Century.) As the rod of correction never fails to be somewhere on the track of the offender, so the preaching of the Catholic priesthood that woman was the cause of all the evil in the world was now rewarded by the refusal to admit her to the pontifical office and the consequent overthrow, under Mary and the great Elizabeth, of the papacy in England. Still no one would suppose, on hearing Your Lordship read the service from the Book of Common Prayer, composed entirely by High Church Bishops, that there ever *was* a woman in England, much less that the Protestant Episcopal Church began in a woman's reign and through a woman's influence, and that a woman is now recognized as its ecclesiastical head, save in the prayer for the Queen and Royal family. You begin by saying, "Dearly beloved *brethren*, the Scripture moveth *us* in sundry places to acknowledge and confess *our* manifold sins and wickedness." I am not sufficiently charitable, My Lord, to attribute to ecclesiastical modesty the omission to include women among those who have committed "manifold sins and wickedness." You desire us to repeat in the Apostles' Creed that Christ "for us *men* and

for *our* salvation came down from heaven." You read the parable of the marriage supper, in which it is said there was present "a *man* who had not on a wedding garment," plainly hinting that the guests were all men; or you may give in charming detail the story in the eighth chapter of John's Gospel of the woman discovered in criminality, but which has been by the late translators expunged from the Bible, not being found in the early manuscripts! You may select that chapter of St. Paul's letter to the Corinthians in which he assures them, with reference to their pagan wives, that "it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church," or, haply, you may read about the hundred and forty-four thousand saints that John saw in heaven (Rev. xiv, 1-4), but not a woman among them, for he tells us that "these are they which were not defiled by women"—a forgery, as I will show by the early bishops—finishing up, My Lord, with the appropriate Levitical commandment, so dear to Your Lordship, in which we are yoked with the ox and the ass! Should you, however, be called upon to perform the funeral service over the remains of a widow, you will read to us, "*man* that is *born of a woman* hath but a short time to live, and is full of misery. He cometh up and is cut down like a *flower*." On reading first Corinthians, 15th chapter, you will refer to the resurrection state and to "every *man* in his own order," evidently because in the great procession there will not be a solitary woman! Should you favour the audience with a sermon you will probably select as your text, "Thou rewardest every *man* according to his work," or "Without holiness no *man* shall see the Lord," when you will speak of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, without their wives, as safely landed in the Kingdom of Heaven! The following day a notice will appear in the *Dominion Churchman*, "Died, at her residence, King Street West, Toronto, Louisa Parthenia, *relict* of the late Canon Brown"—something the old canon had left behind with his boots! Should the more fortunate circumstance of a marriage occur, you will call for a ring—the old pagan emblem of servility, and too often but a link in the chain that ensures a lifelong humiliation—and you bind the charming victim under the vow of perpetual obedience—a papal ceremony galvanized into life by Cranmer, with twelve assistants, in the reign of Edward the Sixth, when superiors, priors and abbots sat in the House of Lords, and when the lords spiritual exceeded the lords temporal. Thus have you made the word of God of none effect through your traditions. But in all this is Your Lordship aware that you are contravening Levitical custom, and exceeding even the Jewish code, which treated marriage merely as a civil contract? The marriage ceremonial among the Hebrews was performed, not by the priests, but by the parents. There was no offering of sacrifice, parade to the temple or tabernacle, or payment of money to an exacting priesthood. "The maidens led the bride, and the young men the bridegroom, to the parents, who placed the right hand of the wife within the right hand of the husband, and pronounced upon them the paternal blessing: 'Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, who didst create Adam and Eve. Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, who causeth Zion to rejoice in her children. Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, who makest the bride and the bridegroom to be glad together. The God of Abraham, the God of Isaac and the God of Jacob be with you, and help you together, and give his blessing richly upon you. Jehovah make the wife that comes into thy house like Rachel and like Leah, who built up the house of Israel.'—(Childs' His. of Women, vol i, p. 16.) Marriage then was performed by the father and mother, but this privilege has been wrested from them by the Christian priesthood, who receive from four to twenty dollars for performing the ceremony because "from an ecclesiastical point of view,"

says Blunt, in his Annotated Book of Common Prayer, "benedictions are beyond the powers of a deacon," and, of course, of a layman, and can only be performed by a priest! Do you not know, My Lord, that during the first twelve hundred years of the church's history marriage among the laity was not solemnized, either in England or elsewhere, by the clergy, and that marriage, as a religious ceremony, was originated by the Pope solely to obtain money? Jacob, in his Law Dictionary, says: "Before the time of Pope Innocent the Third, A.D. 1215, there was no solemnization of marriage in the church; but the man came to the house where the woman inhabited and led her to his own house, which was all the ceremony then used (*vide* Lilly Abtitt Bar and Femme)." Blackstone says: "It is held to be essential to marriage that it be performed by a person in orders; though the intervention of a priest to solemnize this contract is merely *juris positivi*, and not *juris naturalis aut divini*, it being said that Pope Innocent the Third was the first who ordained the celebration of marriage in the church, before which it was totally a civil contract"—(Comm. vol. i, p. 437). The Church of Rome made marriage a sacrament, and though our church pretends not to so regard it, yet the clergy really do so, for in performing the ceremony they use the words in the real sacrament of the Roman Church: "I pronounce that they be man and wife together, in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." "The Church of England" says Blunt "reckons marriage as one of the seven lesser sacraments."

How completely the priesthood has taken possession of us, body and soul! They receive us into the church by baptism, give us our name, receive us from our parents, give us to our husband, marry us (and the best of all) bury us! But what a crime it would be in a Canadian matron to imitate her Jewish sister—and her Christian sister from the days of Christ to the reign of King John—in performing the ceremonial of the marriage covenant! In short, you impose upon women that part of the Jewish code which is the most restrictive, though never intended to be a law unto us, and yet you seize upon its ceremonies—and at the expense of woman's privilege—to make money! Ye blind guides that strain out the gnat and swallow a camel!

GUNHILDA.

---

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

---

A LADY'S LETTERS TO THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

"Is there anything better in a State than that both women and men be rendered the very best? There is not."—*Plato*.

### LETTER III.

MY LORD BISHOP,—That the Apostles and writers of the Old Testament had the gift of inspiration, and that Christianity is a revelation to mankind, there is little room for doubt, and it is a proof forcible and convincing that, notwithstanding the corruption to which Christianity has been exposed in the hands of an unscrupulous priesthood, it continues to refine and purify society, and though interwoven with falsehood, and forged into chains to bind and drag to serfdom its unnumbered suppliants, it shines like the bow on the



brow of evening, and bears fruit like the vine encircling the tree in the ashes of Vesuvius.

But on the principle that what may fetter the weak may not impede the strong, woman, instead of being equally benefitted with man—as the founders of Christianity intended—has profited only by being his servile companion. There never was a greater mistake, My Lord, than the assertion Your Lordship is so fond of making—and with an evident purpose—that the Christian religion has proven to be the especial friend of woman, when the truth is that of the hundreds of religions that have existed, none—except, perhaps, Mahomedanism, as practised by the Turk—has proved such a power in the hands of man to demoralize her nature, to blunt her intellect, and rob her, if possible, of every liberty and virtue with which she was originally endowed. And, if we except the Roman Catholic, what section of the Christian Church has to such a degree sought to restrict her liberties and rob her of honours as the High Church party of the British empire? Nay, it is a truth long since passed into history that, while the papacy has created honorary titles for woman, the High Church clergy of England have succeeded—as will be shown in a subsequent letter—in blotting from the Bible the only honorary title conferred upon her by the pen of inspiration. If Canadian women of the present age are to receive any legislative favours, it must be through the influence of a very few of them whose fingers can touch the throne. It was women like these high-churchism in England first brought under its power, and from that moment women's influence throughout the kingdom began to decline. The most noble order of the Garter, first created in honour of a woman, and first conferred upon women, and worn by the wives of knights for several centuries, but now only by men, was conferred upon a woman for the last time in the reign of Charles the First—whose final and unfortunate political career was in a great measure shaped by Archbishop Laud, the second Cranmer of High Church history. How strange to add that Lady Russell, daughter of the Earl of Southampton, an earnest adherent of the king, when all the men who had grown rich by his bounty had deserted him, stood alone beside the corpse of the beheaded monarch.

The contempt of the High Church clergy for women is perhaps best shown by the title given to the wives of archbishops and bishops, for while the wives of temporal peers receive titles equally honourable with their husbands—which place them upon the same social equality, the wives of spiritual peers—the result of their old indulgence in a plurality of wives—take the same title as that of the ordinary labourer. We address the wife of the Duke of Devonshire as Her Grace the Duchess of Devonshire, and the daughter of an earl, though married to a private gentleman, as “The Honourable Wilmina Blake,” while the wife of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury (the lovely Catharine Spooner, niece of William Wilberforce), though the first peer of the realm, is plain Mrs. Tait, and the wife of “The Right Rev. Father in God, the Lord Bishop of Ontario,” is not even Mrs. Ontario, but merely Mrs. Lewis! So, in exact proportion to the Church's influence with Parliament, woman has lost her political power in England. “In an action at law,” says Child, “it has been determined that an unmarried woman, having a freehold, might vote for members of Parliament; and it is recorded that Lady Packington returned two members to the Commons. Lady Broughton was keeper of the Gate House prison, and in a much later period a woman was appointed governor of the House of Correction at Chelmsford by order of the Court. In the reign of George II, the minister

of Clerkenwell was chosen by a majority of women. The office of Grand Chamberlain, in 1822, was filled by two women, and that of the Clerk of the Crown in the Court of King's Bench has been granted to a female. The celebrated Anna, Countess of Pembroke, held the hereditary office of Sheriff of Westmoreland, and exercised it in person, sitting on the Bench with the judges."—(Vol. ii, page 278.) But though woman's power has passed away, through the corrupting influence and treachery of Christian bishops, the political liberties formerly enjoyed by her will again return on the decline of clerical influence with the advisers of the sovereign. The olive branch of Liberty borne to man by a dove, will be brought to woman by the Lion and the Eagle.

How long, My Lord, would a queen wear the imperial crown were High Churchism the sole guardian of her destiny? If Your Lordship is not aware of the fact, I have the great pleasure of informing you that the High Church, though it had existed since the time of Craumer, first showed itself as a power in England sympathising with the Roman Catholics in the endeavour to sustain a Roman Catholic king upon the throne in preference to a Protestant queen, to secure the Catholic religion as the religion of the State in the person of King James II, and prevent the accession of Mary, a Protestant, who was subsequently deprived of half her throne by her husband William, Prince of Orange. "High Church," says the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, "was a denomination originally given to those otherwise called non-jurors, who refused to acknowledge the title of William III, Prince of Orange, to the crown of Great Britain, on the plea that James II, though excluded, was still their rightful sovereign. This appellation was given them because they entertained high notions of the dignity and power of the Church, and the extent of its prerogative and jurisdiction."

No art of the politician, of the pirate, or of the priest, was ever so wicked in its design, or so cruel in its execution, as the doctrine promulgated by the first Christian bishops that all the sin in the world exists through the agency of woman. This, in the hands of the cunning ecclesiastics, with the establishment of the confessional, by which all the thoughts of her heart could be known, and her capture and captivity were complete. The time when the Christian religion arose was opportune, for the Jewish law had led men to believe that woman has no soul, and this was faithfully copied by the author of the Koran, which all admit to have been founded on the Jewish scriptures—the prime cause of the degraded condition of woman in Mohammedan countries. The Jewish law classed her with the brute, and did not permit her presence on the most solemn occasions, even when the law was given from Mount Sinai.—(Exod. xx, 15.) The commandments also show that no woman was present. "Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife," but nothing is said of a woman coveting her neighbour's husband! The same fact is apparent in Levit. xviii, 20. Thus she is spoken of not only as absent, but as being merely equal to the beast of the field; for, in the commission of the sin referred to in the latter passage, the man is defiled—the woman was not defiled!! It was fitting, therefore, that she should not enjoy the seal of the Jewish covenant! This accords with the story of the fall, in which she is classed with the lower animals, and appears without a soul! We are told that God breathed into Adam's nostrils the breath of life and "*man* became a living soul."—(Gen. ii, 7.) As the word translated *life* in this passage is plural in the Hebrew, it is explained to mean that his spiritual and intellectual life then began to be, and as this was anterior to Eve's creation, it is proper to infer that she was not endowed with

an immortal nature. Hence both the Old and New Testament writers speak of the man only as being in the image of God : "In the image of God created he *him*, male and female created he *them*."—(Gen. i., 26 : v. 21.) "Put on the *new man* which is renewed in knowledge *after the image of Him* that created *him*."—(Col. 4, 10.) Moreover, the animals were considered her equal, for it is said, "but as for Adam there was not found (among the animals) an help-meet for him." And they themselves regarded her as a companion, for they frequently talked with her—one of the crimes alleged against her husband, "Because thou hast hearkened unto the voice of thy wife."—(Gen. iii, 17.) And this contempt for women was not peculiar to the ancient Hebrews, for it exists even to this day. Philo, the Jew, who wrote in the times of the apostles, and is said to have conversed with the Apostle Peter in Egypt, says "woman is destitute of reason," and his great contemporary, Josephus, declares that her testimony ought not to be received in a court of justice.—(Antiq. iv, 8-15.) It is not surprising, therefore, to learn the awful nature of woman's condition among the ancient Jews, for in case of rape, if not betrothed to a man, she was obliged to live for life with her assailant—who may already have possessed several wives—and in this case there was no possibility of divorce. The man had merely to pay a fine of fifty shekels to her father.—(Deuteronomy xxii, 27.) Marvel not, therefore, that the House of Israel have preserved to this hour the following words in their liturgy : "Blessed be Thou O Lord our God, King of the Universe, for not having made me a woman!"

But even this degradation was not sufficient to satisfy the early Christian bishops, for they not only continued Jewish contempt for woman, but taught that she was the cause of the primal fall of man, and that this is the teaching of the Hebrew Scriptures, a doctrine Your Lordship, and the clergy of Your Lordship's diocese, promulgate with as much satisfaction and earnestness as if it were the main tenet of human salvation. This is, no doubt, the reason that of the one hundred and forty four thousand saints that John saw in Heaven there was not a woman among them (Rev. xiv, 3); and that Your Lordship is so anxious that only boys shall sing in the chancel—they look so much more like angels!

But for this doctrine of the fall, there is not the slightest scriptural foundation. Adam, and not Eve, was forbidden to taste the interdicted tree. The commandment was, "In the day thou (in the singular number) eatest thereof thou (not *ye*) shalt surely die."—(Gen. ii, 17.) This command was given before woman's creation, and surely she could not be held responsible for what had occurred before she existed. The New Testament writers exonerate her in terms clear and unmistakable from all responsibility in the fall. Paul, the most eloquent, and the most learned, says, "In Adam (not in Eve) all die."—(1st Cor., xv, 22.) "By one man (not one woman) sin entered into the world."—(Rom. v, 12.) Among the Essens, a sect mentioned by Josephus, woman was held in the most profound contempt, as she was also among the Christians, especially the Gnostics. The Archontics, a sect of the latter, in the second century, taught that she was a creation of Satan. Similar was the teaching of the Enchites of the next century, who refused to marry, lest the corruption to which their wives would expose them should debar them from Paradise. And it is a truth beyond dispute that the so called Christian fathers were the most stolid enemies of woman. Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Athenagoras, Tertullian, Origen and Lactantius, all were opposed to marrying at all, and "there is no doubt that if the clergy had had their way," says Huth, "they



would have forbidden all mankind as they forbade themselves ever to enter into the bonds of matrimony.”—(Marriage of Near Kin, p. 75.) The evident reason was twofold. First, they considered woman, as the Jewish law always regarded her, a wicked outlaw, unworthy of a man’s companionship; and second, the number of wives would then be unlimited; but, unlike the restraints with the Jews and other polygamous nations, without the responsibility of supporting them.

Among the pagan Romans no citizen was allowed more than one wife, and “the Roman law supposed woman,” says the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, “never to go astray without the seductions and arts of the other sex.” No sooner, however, had Christianity become the religion of the state, even so early as the reign of Valentinian (A.D. 364) than an effort was made to legalize polygamy; “nor does it appear,” says Rees (whose words are repeated by the *Encyclopedia Britannica*), “from the ecclesiastical history of those times that the *bishops* made any opposition to this introduction of polygamy.” The Church, however, did not then institute laws to immediately prevent marriage, for they knew the state of public opinion would prevent their enforcement, but it instituted an accelerated restriction—which Your Lordship is striving to sustain—which in the course of time rendered marriage as difficult as in Central Africa, where the first condition is the presenting to the king the head of an enemy. “The rise of Christianity,” says Huth “prohibited marriage within degrees ridiculously distant from its bias towards asceticism.” In the year A.D. 741 marriage was forbidden when any relationship, however distant, existed, and so early as the year A.D. 325 the first Nicene Council prohibited marriage with bridesmaids, a wife’s god-daughter or god-child. This was confirmed by Pope Zachry A.D. 745, and by the Council of Trent in A.D. 1560. The latter, however, declared that the person baptized, his parents, god-fathers, and the baptizing priest were as much related to one another as though they were connected by blood!! This is the doctrine by which Your Lordship seeks to defeat this bill, viz., the doctrine of a spiritual relationship created by a religious ceremony. In your petition last winter to the Commons, Your Lordship stated that “by the law of Christ a man and his wife become one flesh.” This, however, does not reach the point, for the Scriptures do not say that a husband and *his wife’s sister* become one flesh! Hence Your Lordship and the Metropolitan of Canada have revived the doctrine first promulgated in our church by Rev. Mr. Madan, a Church of England clergyman of the seventeenth century, and a vehement advocate of polygamy, that ecclesiastical affinity is consanguinity, the same as that originated by the Nicene Council and Pope Zachry, that a wife’s god-daughter, god-child and the baptizing priest—all ecclesiastical affinities—are relatives by blood—all become one flesh—a doctrine palpably invented to enable the priest to lay claim to property not belonging to him by inheritance! This is the doctrine of transubstantiation which Your Lordship, with the old clerical stealth, is endeavouring to foist upon the church people of this Dominion—High-Churchism, most truly thou worse than the papists and all the popes. That this is none other than the offspring of heathenism appears from the following passage in Fullom:—“The marriages of the ancient Medes were consecrated by a curious ceremony. The plighted pair, in the presence of their mutual relatives and friends, made an incision in each other’s arms and mingled their blood, which was received in a goblet and drank as a pledge of harmony by the bride and bridegroom.”—(P. 144.) Need you wonder, My Lord, why the real practical business people who make this country respect-

able even for priests are leaving the church when the clergy so positively invade the first principles of common sense?

Woman, believing herself the most guilty and corrupt of all created beings, as she was daily assured by the clergy, in order to avoid eternal exclusion from Paradise, threw herself with all her affections and possessions upon the church, and it is a truth not only patent to the historian, but to us, that the church, in all its branches and in all ages, owes the greatest part of its wealth, its splendid edifices, its political and moral power, its influence in foreign countries, and its respectability throughout the world, to the devotion and energy of woman. How many have there been like Matilda, "a powerful Italian princess who, in the year 1102," says Mosheim, "gave her splendid inheritance to the church, which they hold to this day," (vol. ii, p. 819) and will it be believed that, notwithstanding the general surrender, even the little they had remaining was stripped from them at the confessional! "In the reign of Valentinian" (A.D. 364), says Fullon, "the spoliation of the property of devout women by rapacious monks and priests, who had obtained direction of their conscience, was carried to such an extent that severe laws were enacted for the suppression of the evil, and a confessor incapacitated from receiving any legacy from his fair penitents. Still, means were found to evade the statutes, and Damasus, Bishop of Rome, their guardian and administrator, was himself so deeply implicated in such proceedings that he acquired the soubriquet of "The Ladies' Ear Scratcher." St. Jerome does not escape a similar imputation (*History of Women*, p. 215). The extent to which women are misled and wronged is only equalled by the efforts of the clergy to secure their influence for the support of the church. The clergyman who seeks to pervert the judgment and enslave the minds of his flock by misleading sermons, and the ruffian who barter for gold the freedom of the slave who has fled to him for protection, are embarked in the same bottom. How long would the High Church exist in Canada—the church that is now pre-eminently the enemy of woman—were it not for the pecuniary aid of its female members, whose personal and domestic relations and liberties it seems your peculiar province and aim to restrict. According to the *Dominion Churchman*, Your Lordship confirmed 484 males and 840 females within the last year, and it may safely be asserted on the assurance of past experience, that in ten years the former number will diminish to one-fourth, and that each of the latter will contribute, or cause to be contributed, ten times the sum contributed by the former. And what a poor return for all her care and devotion, often to the sacrifice of her own personal comfort! And how seldom it occurs to her that unlimited power to the cause she most loves means her disgrace and loss of liberty. "The order of knighterrant or chivalry, whose business it was to protect females from the strong" says Mosheim, "was created in the most wicked age of the church's history." So long has the church promulgated woman's mental and moral depravity that the public, naturally enough, especially in the mother country, where High Churchism is most powerful, have come to believe that women, even the most noble and distinguished, are not entitled to the privileges enjoyed by the meanest man in the realm. How fully is this illustrated in the Baroness Burdett-Coutts, the great benefactress of the present century—a woman who would have been worshipped as a goddess "in the brave days of old!" Several European monarchs, whose lives seem devoted to the spoliation and corruption of their subjects, have recently taken to themselves a number of wives, morganatically, and thus legally live like modern Solomons, and, naturally enough, without



any word of reproof or adverse comment from priest or bishop ; but the moment the charming Baroness—her sun quite past the meridian—attempts to enter the marriage condition, though her companion is acknowledged amiable, talented and exemplary, she is rebuked and jibed at by the highest and the lowest—the former the meanest—in the kingdom, though her bounty has sailed on every sea, supported missionaries in every clime, and her noble hand has saved the lives of starving thousands.

While the Canadian Government was passing measures through Parliament last session, endowing women with the same powers as to holding and conveying property, as men, in what was Your Lordship engaged in the way of recompensing those who support Your Lordship's person and dignity? Shall I tell the Canadian people that you were then communicating with the other Anglican bishops of the Dominion,—High Churchmen like yourself—prompting them to issue a bull, like that issued by Your Lordship, commanding their clergy, without respect to their conscience, to preach a sermon to the laity and to denounce the bill before the Commons as unscriptural, and its introduction a crime in the eyes of the nation, urging them with all possible speed to obtain a petition from the women—alas too ready at the service of the priesthood to the cost of liberty!—asking that the bill might not pass! But when the Campbell case was before Parliament last session, what did Your Lordship do to secure justice to that much wronged and outraged woman? Here was an occasion when the loud voice of Duty called you, not merely as a Protestant prelate, but as a Christian minister. While the Hon. William Macdougall, in a speech that did him honour, was pressing Parliament to support the claims of Mrs. Campbell, simply on the grounds of equity and Christian decency, did Your Lordship remember the Mosaic injunction to the priesthood—"Thou shalt not respect the person of the poor nor honour the person of the mighty, but in *righteousness* shalt thou judge thy neighbour."—(Lev. xix, 15.) Did Your Lordship preach a sermon on the text "Husbands love your wives?" Oh, no. You were found, My Lord, where the law of contrarieties always places you—on the side of the strong against the weak, sympathizing with the oppressor and against the oppressed. "There is no vice," says Lord Bacon, "that doth so cover a man with shame as to be found false and perfidious."

In the reign of King Charles the Second, the Earl of Rochester wrote the following lines on the door of the royal bed-chamber, and I never read them but I think of Your Lordship :—

"Here lies our sovereign lord the king,  
Whose word no man relies on,  
Who never said a foolish thing,  
And never did a wise one."

GUNHILDA.

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

A LADY'S LETTERS TO THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

"Nothing doth more hurt in a state than that cunning men pass for wise."—*Lord Bacon*.

- LETTER IV.

MY LORD BISHOP,—The good, though brave in the field, are always timid in approaching evil. History furnishes many examples of barbaric

valour, but none more remarkable than that of Prometheus, who abducted fire from Heaven. If Horace, who speaks of this as a "wicked fraud," had lived in the subsequent century, he would have found the barbarian's peer in the prelates of the Christian church.

St. Ignatius, so early as the year A.D. 107, asserts that "the Bishop sits in *God's place*," but even this assumed authority would not fully compensate for the absence of Scriptural proof in support of the tenets of the church. The doctrine of the Trinity was one of the first disputed, and as no inspired writer could be cited in its support with sufficient clearness to place it beyond cavil, that famous passage, "There are three that bear record in heaven—the Father, the Word and the Holy Ghost—and these three are one" (John v, 7), was forged by the bishops and fitted into John's Epistle, but has now been expunged by the present translators. Josephus quotes a passage from the Old Testament, "A woman is inferior to her husband in all things," but as this is no longer to be found, as Whiston, his translator, points out, it no doubt was disposed of by the same school that invented it. About the close of the second, and so late as the fifth, century, a large number of uninspired passages were placed into the writings of the evangelists and apostles, many of which we shall probably never be able to discover, and this could only have been perpetrated by the bishops, or with their knowledge and consent, as they alone had charge of the sacred writings. These forgeries being completed, the bishops then invented a passage making St. Peter its author, saying they were inspired by the Holy Ghost.—(St. Pet. i, 21.)

The bishops in Egypt were the most superstitious of the early Christian teachers, and have always been noted for their tincture of Egyptian mythology. Our suspicion may well be aroused on learning that all the oldest and best manuscripts of the Greek Bible now remaining were written by Egyptian penmen at Alexandria—that of Paris, that of the Vatican, that of Cambridge, that of the British Museum, and that from Mount Sinai, now in Russia. In Alexandria were made the Ethiopic version, and probably the early Latin version. The Armenian version and the old Syriac version were corrected in Alexandria from the most approved and newest Greek text.—(Sharps' *Egyptian Mythology*, p. 113.) We know that Matthew first wrote his gospel in Hebrew, and as he does not give the story of the Saviour's miraculous birth it is only reasonable to conclude that it was afterwards interpolated by the early bishops.

About this time, to obtain the divine sanction to woman's depravity, appeared the famous story—the eighth chapter of John's Gospel—concerning a woman's infamy, the innocence of the men who brought her to the Saviour, and who suggested she should be stoned according to Your Lordship's law—all of which has been condemned as a forgery, for the late translators have put a note in the margin saying, "Most of the ancient authorities omit it." The first part of the fourteenth chapter of Revelation is of the same wicked stock, and should not have been retained in the new edition, unless, indeed, the old doctrine of no women in heaven is still to do duty with the priesthood. Eusebius Pamphilus, Bishop of Cæsarea, the Father of Ecclesiastical History (A.D. 264), and the most reliable authority of those days, though accused by Gibbon of favouring the church at the expense of truth, and he himself confesses the crime (Lib. viii, c. 2 and De Martyr Palestin ii, c. 12), says the genuineness of the Book of Revelation was in his day greatly disputed. That this book is a forgery is proved beyond all doubt by a circumstance mentioned by St. Epiphanius (De Hæres, p. 51), viz., that the Alogians, a sect of Christians in the latter part of the second century,

disputed its genuineness because the Church of Thyatira (Rev. ii, 18), one of the Seven Churches of Asia (Rev. i, 11), to which this book was addressed, did not exist till their day, nearly a hundred years after the death of John, a fact to which St. Epiphanius himself bears testimony; and you will believe me, My Lord, when I say that the council of bishops at Laodicea, in the year A.D. 360, at which were the bishops of these same "Seven Churches of Asia," unanimously voted that this Book of Revelation is not genuine. That the second Epistle of Peter is a forgery of the first century, Eusebius positively declares, and among modern scholars this opinion is fearlessly asserted—as Grotius, Cajetan, Scalager, Salmasius, Semler, Neander, Crednor, DeWette, Reuss and Mayerhoff. Eusebius further says, that the Epistle of James and the second and third Epistles of John were in his century condemned as spurious. These are the words of the most learned and pious of the early Christian bishops. Manes, one of the most active promulgators of the Christian religion (though corrupted with Eastern fables) in the third century, and whose morality is eulogized by St. Augustine, "rejected nearly all the sacred books," says Mosheim, "in which Christians think their religion to be contained. The four histories of Christ, which we call gospels, he either denied to have been composed by the apostles, or he maintained that if they were so, they had been corrupted, interpolated and amplified with Jewish fables by crafty and mendacious men (meaning, of course, the bishops). The Acts of the Apostles he wholly rejected."—(Ecc. History, third century, p. 268.) It is a remarkable fact that while all the East was flooded with books pretending to have been written by the apostles, but really forgeries of the bishops to induce the heathen to accept Christianity, the books we now regard as canonical were almost entirely unknown. "It was from the Gospel of our Saviour's Infancy, from the Gospel of the Birth of Mary, and the Protevangelion of St. James," says the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, "that Mahomet derived all his knowledge of our Saviour's life. He does not seem to have been acquainted with the canonical gospels, and the legends of the East in general are all from Apocryphal sources." "The Platonists and Pythagoreans," says Mosheim, "deemed it not only lawful, but commendable, to deceive and *lie* for the sake of truth and piety. The Jews living in Egypt learned from them this sentiment before the Christian era, as appears from many proofs, and, from both, this vice early spread among the Christians. Of this no one will doubt who calls to mind the numerous forgeries of books under the names of eminent men, the Sibylline verses, and I know not what besides, a large mass of which appeared in this age (second century), and subsequently. I would not say that the Orthodox Christians forged ALL the books of this character; on the contrary, it is probable that the greater part of them originated with the founders of the Gnostic (Christian) sects. Yet that the Christians who were *free* from heterodox views were not wholly free from this fault is too clear to be denied."—(Ecc. Hist., second century, p. 179.) Will you believe me, My Lord, that during the last few years I have, greatly against my will, slowly come to the conclusion that there is scarcely a writing that has come down to us, whether Jewish, Christian or pagan, that does not contain some passages in favour of Christianity that were forged by the first Christian bishops! A few years ago I was disputing in a distant city with a Jewish rabbi concerning the death and resurrection of Christ, and after quoting those well known words of Tacitus (vol. i, p. 42, Oxford Translation), and a passage from Suetonius, both of which the learned gentleman—for he *was* learned—pronounced as forgeries by the Christian bishops, I turned upon him Jewish



evidence, citing the distinguished words of Josephus (Antiquities xviii, 3, 3) in which that author declares that Jesus, called the Christ, died and rose again the third day. Imagine my horror when, stepping into his library, the scholastic rabbi laid before me a volume of the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, and opening it with a triumphant smile requested me to read the following passage: "The famous passage of Josephus (Antiq. xviii, 3, 3) referring to Christ, and which is referred to by Eusebius, was never called in question as to its genuineness till the sixteenth century, when Gifanius and Osiander refused to receive it. Since that period it has afforded matter for much controversy among the learned. It is found in all the copies of the works of Josephus from the time of Eusebius. It also exists in a Hebrew translation in the Vatican and there is an Arabic version preserved by the Maronites of Mount Libanus also containing it. Josephus mentions John the Baptist, and the death of James the brother of Jesus called the Christ. (Antiq. xx., 9, 1.) *Strange to say no defender of Christians before Eusebius quoted Josephus' testimony of Christ, and in particular Origen.*" You see, said he, that this is a forgery, and so is every passage in Josephus that speaks of Jesus, whom you blindly call the Christ. Who wrote the Jewish Scriptures? said I. Moses, who conversed with God as a man speaks with a friend, he replied. Where were they after the Babylonian Captivity? Were they not all lost at that period, and does not a Hebrew writer of the highest respectability tell us—a fact which all the Christian Fathers taught and believed—that they were all reproduced three hundred years afterwards by Ezra (Esdras ii, 14-21)? You may say, as you will say, that they were re-written by Ezra through inspiration, but I shall speak of it under another name. He could not answer, nor could Your Lordship, for you will find these same writings of Esdras ranked as canonical in the Book of Common Prayer. I then remarked that Christianity, even if it be a false system of morals, is infinitely superior to any other, and especially Judaism, which regards woman as man's slave. "Ah!" said he, warming under my remarks, "but we never sell our women, at all events, for a pipe of tobacco." I instantly remembered having read the following in Dr. McElheran's "Condition of Women": "The Republican commissioners under Cromwell recommended that Irish women be sold to merchants, and transported to Virginia, New England. This was in 1652. A manuscript in Dr. Lingard's possession gave the total number at 60,000. Brandin, a contemporary, says 100,000. *They were mostly exchanged for tobacco*" (p. 146). My reply was, the Jews did not sell their women, for having so long kept them in bondage and ignorance they were not desirable in the eyes of even the heathen, besides they required them all for wives! But the learned rabbi was correct as to the passage in Josephus, for if it had existed in Origen's time he would certainly have cited it, as it exactly meets the point he had in dispute.

The Church of Rome has been as faithful in imitating the early bishops in producing fraudulent writings as in copying the old ceremonies of the heathen. "That men might lend more readily ears and acquiescence to this new system of ecclesiastical law, viz., that the Bishop of Rome was constituted by Jesus Christ a legislator and judge over the whole earth so very different from the old one there was need of ancient documents and records," says Mosheim, "with which it might be enforced and defended against the assaults of opponents. Hence the Roman Pontiff procured the forgery by trusty friends of conventions, acts of councils, epistles and other documents which made it seem that from the earliest ages of the church their predecessors possessed all the majesty and power now claimed by themselves.

Among these fraudulent supports the so called *Decretal Epistles* of the Pontiffs of the first centuries hold perhaps the first rank. They were produced by the ingenuity of an obscure man who falsely assumed the name of Isidore, a Spanish bishop. Of similar origin and value are the decrees of a Roman council said to have been held under Sylvester (A.D. 324), but which was never known by any one till the ninth century." (Ecc. Hist. 9th century, page 188.) Since the Reformation there has been no opportunity to humiliate women by forging passages of Scripture, but the little opportunity there has been in falsely interpreting them has been adroitly improved. Not to mention the weekly sermons that are preached especially by Your Lordship to indicate the almost bewitching wickedness of woman's nature, it is fitting to notice the advantage that has been taken in Scripture translations. That passage, "Know ye not that he who made them in the beginning made them male and female"—so translated by the clergy in the reign of King James I—is in a great degree responsible for the propagation of Mormonism. This was constantly on the lips of Brigham Young, who, with this as a text, declared with Your Lordship and Rev. Martin Madan, a Church of England clergyman who wrote two large volumes entitled "Thelyphthora," in advocacy of polygamy—the law of Christ to be the same as the law of Moses, no limit to the number of wives, on the ground that he gave no marriage decree, but merely said that God in the beginning made them "male and female." What a different meaning attaches to it when rendered according to the Greek original, as Dean Alford directs, "one male and one female." But there was another opportunity to indicate the wickedness in woman—in misrepresenting Job's wife—"curse God and die."—(Jobix., 2). To have translated it "bless God and die" would not have suited the dignitaries of the high church party. Lee says, speaking of this passage in his Hebrew Grammar, "it is impossible that *curse* is meant" (p. 89). Hahn says it should read "praise God all the time." Carey says it should be rendered, "bless God and die." Lange says the same, but adds, like a *gentle man*, that she said so in scorn? But even if this be so, why were her words not properly given, that she might not appear as cursing God—a crime that has been artfully attributed by the priesthood through her to the unhallowed nature of women in general. So in the New Testament—in the new edition as well—the translators have rendered *diakonos* by *servant* instead of *deaconess*, the very word which is translated *deacon* when applied to men! "I commend to you Phœbe our sister, who is a deaconess of the Church."—(Rom. xvi, 1.) It would not do with the priesthood for women to hold office in the Church, so they did not scruple, in order to rob them of the honour conferred on them by the apostles to translate the word *servant*. King James the First, who was wise enough to say "No bishop, no king," gave great latitude to the spiritual power, and hence it is not surprising that in the reign of a monarch who sincerely believed in the existence of demons, the bishops should be enabled to pass a bill through the House of Lords concerning witchcraft that had no equal in point of severity since the Reformation. As the recent translation of the Bible was made in this reign, there was a fine opportunity to fasten the prevailing prejudice against womankind upon the Holy Scriptures. Hence Dr. Hutchinson (A.D. 1720) says, "The translation of our Bible being made by King James' particular desire has received some phrases that favour the vulgar notions more than did the former translation. At that unhappy time was brought in that gross notion of a *familiar spirit*, though the Hebrew word has no epithet at all, and should rather have been translated in some of those words that signify a *cheating*

*ventriloquist.*" The present refined condition of women, My Lord, is not due to the influence of the clergy, but to the attributing to them by our northern ancestors a divine nature which they believed the gods intended to guide men, especially in war. The learned Bannier informs us that the Gauls made a compact with Hannibal, the Carthaginian general, that if a Gaul and a Carthaginian should have a dispute it should be referred to the tribunal of Gallic women. In his war against Ariovistus, king of the Germans, Cæsar informs us (Gallic War, b. i, cap. 50) that "among the Germans it was the custom of their matrons to pronounce from lots and divinations whether it were expedient that the battle should be engaged in or not." Who can read without tears this picture drawn by the Roman general—the battle with the Germans! The greatness of the barbarian army can be imagined by the camp fires twenty miles long. "The king," says Cæsar, "stationed his army in front of his chariots and baggage waggons, that no hope might be left in flight. On these they placed their women, who, with dishevelled hair and in tears, entreated the soldiers, as they went forward to battle, not to deliver them into slavery to the Romans." Cæsar speaks of the dispersion of the German army and the precipitate flight of King Ariovistus, of the capture of his daughter fleeing towards the Rhine, but says nothing of the countless women who beheld the engagement. Let us draw the curtain with a sigh, with a conviction, however cruel, that it is well men alone have been the historians.

Little do we know of the advantages accruing to women through the accession to the English throne of the House of Brunswick. Women can never be too grateful for the German sentiment respecting the female character that in the present age pervades mankind, the sentiment which seems destined to nullify the poison of high churchism in England and of the papacy throughout the world. How different the doctrine of the church to that of the ancient savages—the Germanic tribes—from whom we happily sprung, a doctrine which originated with Jews and Italians, the most sensual and vulgar of wretched humanity. Constant preaching upon the satanic nature of woman ultimately bore fruit, and a century ago no sermon would so stir the multitude to deeds of blood as one preached over the witch of Endor or from the text "Thou shalt not suffer a witch to live."—(Exod. xxii, 18.) To ferret out and burn witches appears to have been the chief business of the clergy. In Archbishop Cranmer's Articles of Visitation we read: "You shall inquire whether you know of any that use charms, sorcery, enchantments, witchcraft, soothsaying, or any like craft invented by the devil." In a sermon preached before Queen Elizabeth in 1558, Bishop Jewel said: "It may please Your Grace to understand that witches and sorcerers within these four last years are marvelously increased within Your Grace's realm. Your Grace's subjects pine away even unto death, their colour fadeth, their flesh rotteth, their speech is benumbed, their senses are bereft. I pray God they may never practise further than upon the subject."—(Rees.) Dean Hook, in his *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, says: "On the accession of Queen Mary, being called to account for his principles, Bishop Jewel, under fear of torture and the stake, renounced all that laid him open to a suspicion of Protestantism."—(Vol. ix, p. 277.) I have now to relate, which, however, may not be unknown to Your Lordship, that, in the words of the present Bishop of Exeter, "This table of kindred and affinity was drawn up by Archbishop Parker, in concert with Bishop Jewel, in 1553, and was adopted by a canon of the convocation in 1571," of which Archbishop Whitgift,—an equally extraordinary character, of whom I am yet to speak, was a member! Will Your Lordship be surprised when I say that this same Bishop Jewel, in a letter to



Archbishop Parker, used these words, which should forever silence Your Lordship: "I would they (the bishops) would decree it were lawful to marry two sisters, so would the world be out of doubt."—(*Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, vol. ix, p. 359.) It would not be difficult for a man of Bishop Jewel's mental constitution any more than for Your Lordship to believe in a change of flesh through a religious ceremony, which is only another form of the papal doctrine of transubstantiation, and in which I think Bishop Jewel, like Archbishop Cranmer, the author of the thirty-nine articles, believed. And even Archbishop Parker, who was an earnest advocate of crucifixes and images in churches (*Lives*, vol. ix, p. 555), was so ardently Roman Catholic as to be in constant fear of assassination by the Puritans. "The fact is," says Hook, "though Archbishop Parker was a Reformer, he was not by any means an enthusiastic Protestant."—(*Lives*, vol. ix, p. 89.) These are the words of a high dignitary of the Church of England, who, however, would have been nearer the truth had he said that Archbishop Parker was as much of a papist as the Pope himself. "But this table of affinity," says Lord Houghton, "stands solely on the authority of the Archbishop himself, having force only within his own province. It has been contended that the table was adopted and sanctioned by the canons of 1603, but these canons, having no force themselves, can give no effect to the table, for they have never been sanctioned by Parliament."

In the reign of James I, a law was placed upon the statute book forbidding persons to "consult with, covenant with, entertain, employ, feed or reward any evil or wicked spirit," and this was not repealed till the ninth year of the reign of George III. "The Romanists," says Sir Walter Scott, "became extremely desirous to combine the doctrine of the heretics with witchcraft, which, according to their account, abounded especially where the Protestants were most numerous, and, the bitterness increasing, they scrupled not to throw the charge of sorcery upon those who dissented from the Catholic standard of faith."—(*Demonology and Witchcraft*, p. 194.) "Pope Innocent VIII issued a bull," says Sir Walter Scott, "which was followed by the burning of thousands of innocent women all over Europe. In 1515 five hundred were executed at Geneva under the character of "Protestant witches." In 1524 a thousand persons were put to death in one year at Como, in Italy, and about one hundred every year for several years. In one instance forty persons were executed in the Swedish villages of Mohra, of whom fifteen were children." "The ministers of the Church of England, continues Sir Walter, meaning, no doubt, those who most sympathized with Rome, in other words, the high church bishops, "are far from being entirely free of the charge of encouraging the witch superstition."—(p. 230.) "In the year 1645"—for the clergy were the chief makers of law—"a commission of Parliament was sent down comprehending two clergymen in esteem with the leading party, one of whom, Fairclough, of Kellar, preached before the rest on the subject of witchcraft, and after this appearance of inquiry the inquisitions and executions went on as before."—(p. 252.)

But the demon of witchcraft—the climax of the doctrine so long promulgated by the priesthood, woman's greatest foe—has breathed its last in our own day and in the very presence of those who gave it birth. Well may the women of Canada shudder at the thought of bishops and priests attempting to influence the legislation of the State.

Truth crushed to earth shall rise again,  
The eternal years of God are hers;  
But Error, wounded, writhes in pain,  
And dies among his worshippers.

GUNHILDA.

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

## A LADY'S LETTERS TO THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

"Forty-two thousand adult women of Leeds, England, have signed a petition desiring the House of Commons to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister."—*Dominion Churchman*.

## LETTER V.

MY LORD BISHOP,—A few months ago the editor of a Russian journal was banished to Siberia for criticising a sermon preached by the Bishop of Moscow, in which he affirmed the Czar's infallibility and that of his ministers while executing his commands in the government of the empire. But the Russian bishop was only imitating his predecessors in the Jewish priesthood for they educated their people to "worship God and the King" (Chron., xxvii, 20)—the same dogma of infallibility that is perpetuated by the Church of Rome, and till recently was guarded by a penalty even more severe than that inflicted by the Emperor of all the Russias. This was continued in the Church of England under the paternal care of Cranmer, the High Church Archbishop of Canterbury, who ordered Annie Eskew and Joan Bocher to be burned for denying the doctrines promulgated by the *infallible* Henry the Eighth. The same penalty he inflicted on John Frith for denying the doctrine of transubstantiation. You have read, My Lord, of Hypatia, a maid, "not more distinguished for her beauty," says Fullon, "than for her learning and virtue." This young lady opposed the doctrine of St. Cyril, Archbishop of Alexandria (A.D. 412), who, it would appear, considered himself infallible, when by his instructions she was seized, dragged naked through the streets, and then torn limb from limb on the steps of the cathedral.—(Hist. of Woman, p. 215.) Liberty of the press is interwoven with liberty to woman, and one cannot exist without the other. His Muscovite Majesty who banishes the knights of literary progress to Siberia, keeps the women of his dominion in servitude, marries wives morganatically, and breaks the heart of his empress. Need he marvel if, like Napoleon III, of equally wicked memory, he should see in the midst of his dreams the ghost of a fallen Cæsar pointing to Phillippi, or the handwriting upon the wall proclaiming that his kingdom is divided and given to the Medes and Persians.

In all ages of the world's history theocratic kingdoms, whose chief divinities were gods and not goddesses, have been singular for their savage nature and oppression of women; and it is equally true—for deities whether true or false merely reflect the character of their worshippers—that those whose chief divinities were female deities, as Egypt, Greece and Rome, were not only the most learned and civilized, but the only conquerors of the world; so that, if any lesson may be learned from the past, it is that the ruling nation of the future will be distinguished for her political indulgence and personal liberties to women. The history of the Hebrew nation is a witness to the truth of this principle; for though its Deity was the true God, it was not only the most cruel of all ancient kingdoms, but the most despotic in its political, ecclesiastical and domestic economies. Woman was a slave in law and custom, though the prophet speaks of the kingdoms of Judah and Israel as having descended from two women (Ezek. xxviii, 2). The Christian church, the offspring of the Jewish, is represented in the Scriptures by a woman clothed with the sun and the moon under her feet (Rev. xii, 1), and is compared to a woman in being the spouse of Christ, and yet in Christian nations to-day woman is comparatively less esteemed, and has less influence in the government of the



state than among the barbarian nations of antiquity. The reason is obvious : because the Jewish Scriptures are read in our Sunday schools and churches, and priests and bishops press their Jewish ideas upon the law makers of the realm. How few think of this when they hear Your Lordship reading the words of the pious and merciful Psalmist : "Blessed shall he be that shall take your little ones and dash their heads in pieces against the stones" (Ps. cxxxvii, 9), a passage our clergy read with as much relish as if they were sipping wine at a political banquet at Ottawa. "A large portion of the romantic interest which Grecian legend inspires," says Grote, "is derived from the women. Penelope, Andromache, Helen, Clytemnestra, Eriphyle, Jocasta and Hecuba all stand in the foreground of the picture, either from their virtues, their beauty, their crimes or their sufferings."—(History of Greece.) The legends concerning the Amazons, whether true or false, prove that woman's power and influence were recognized as a public fact. Juno, Minerva, Diana and Isis, of the Egyptians, attest the popular estimation in woman's divinity and equality even in heaven ; and, being favourable to their own sex, permitted neither concubinage or polygamy. Continents and kingdoms in those days—Greek, Phœnician and Egyptian—took their names from women. Europe received its name from a Phœnician princess, and Carthage from the sister of the Tyrian king. "Lybia," says Herodotus, "is said by most of the Greeks to take its name from a native woman by the name of Libya, and Asia from the wife of Prometheus."—(Melpomene, p. 252.) In ancient times Ireland bore several different names, derived from the names of the illustrious queens that governed that country. In Greece women had political rights equal to the men, and could not only vote in the public assemblies, but officiate in the temples and sit as prophetesses, queens and judges—and were no doubt the originators of that law in Athens that inflicted the severest penalty upon the master who should offer a personal insult to his female slave. That the mother was absolute mistress of the household—which she certainly is not now—we learn from the dispute between Agamemnon and his wife concerning their daughter's marriage. Themistocles said : "My little boy rules Athens, for he governs his mother and his mother governs me." The women of Rome took as much interest in the government of their country as the men, for we learn from Polybius that on the approach of Hannibal after the massacre of 80,000 Roman troops at the battle of Cannæ that the women of Rome "went around the temple offering supplications to the gods and sweeping the pavement with their hair."—(General History, p. 229.) The maidens and matrons of Carthage shaved off their bountiful tresses to make cordage at the invasion of Scipio. The most successful men of antiquity always sought the council of their wives, which reminds us of the wife of Lord Beaconsfield, of Mrs. Gladstone, Lady Palmerston and that beautiful woman called the Great Electress, the Duchess of Devonshire. "Modern Europe," says Gibbon, "has produced several illustrious women who have sustained with glory the weight of empire." "Some of the greatest characters of ancient and modern times," says Butler, "have been educated by women." Speaking of Sesostris, King of Egypt, who was one of the world's conquerors, and who took and plundered Jerusalem in the reign of Rehoboam, son of Solomon, Herodotus says that, learning of certain plots against his life, "he immediately consulted with his wife, *for he always took his wife with him.*"—(Euterpe, p. 134.) It was Atossa, daughter of Cyrus the Great and queen of Darius of Persia, who induced the latter to engage in the famous war against Greece. Her son, King Xerxes, who subsequently conducted the campaign, was accompanied at the head of his army by his queen, Amestris. Queen Artemesia,

an ally and tributary of Persia, sailed in the fleet of Xerxes as commander of a squadron, "and of all the allies," says Herodotus, "gave the best advice to the king." Xerxes was defeated in the naval engagement at Salamis by neglecting to take her advice, which resulted in the almost complete annihilation of his army of five million of soldiers, and her skill and valour in the retreat caused King Xerxes to exclaim, "My men have become women and my women men." At the battle of Platea, fought and lost to the Persians in this campaign, the wife of Pharandates, the Persian commander, was found on the battlefield covered with gold and gems, and on her condition being made known to Pausanias, the victorious Spartan king, she was delivered to her friends in safety—an incident that could never occur among a people influenced by the tutelage of modern ecclesiastics. Perhaps the best example of the dignity of women under the ancient pagan government is the vestal virgins of Rome, maidens dedicated to serve in the temple of Vesta. These virgins were at liberty to dispose of their property and possessions as they pleased; their evidence was received in courts of justice without the formality of an oath, and in difficult cases they were often chosen as judges and arbitrators. They had the power of pardoning criminals whom they met accidentally in the streets; the chief places were assigned them at the public games, and all classes, from the highest magistrates to the slave, fell back at their approach, the very lectors of the consul turning their *fusces* as they passed.—(Fullom, p. 183.) In Lacedemonia "large dowries were given to daughters, often to the complete spoliation of the sons; and it was a common occurrence for a Spartan, at his death, to leave his property exclusively to his daughter. By law and custom wealth was allowed to accumulate in the hands of women; but a rich man, however innocent and blameless his conduct, was looked upon with suspicion. Women were allowed the utmost liberty, and Xenophon and Plutarch described them as taking part in the public games.—(Fullom.) "The Egyptian women," says Herodotus "attend markets and traffic, but the men stay home and weave. Sons are not compelled to support their parents unless they choose, but daughters are compelled to do so whether they choose or not" (Euterpe, p. 108.); because, like the women of Sparta, but unlike modern Englishwomen, they inherited the property. Diodorus Siculus informs us that the husband in ancient Egypt promised obedience to the wife at the marriage ceremony, when the weak, as if to compensate for the absence of physical energy, were accorded even greater liberties than the strong. How exactly converse the liberties, or rather the want of them, in our day, only to be accounted for on the principle enunciated by Garrick, that "corrupted freemen are the worst of slaves." And yet though public opinion was mainly shaped in ancient days by woman and public morality was almost entirely due to her, we find Mr. Parkman, in a letter that has accorded him more notoriety than credit, saying that though "many women have worn crowns we look among them in vain for one of those royal benefactors of the race," and that "instead of purifying politics they corrupted them!" But the liberties given to women in those days had an effect quite the contrary to that announced by Mr. Parkman, and other vaporous haters of women in modern times. Mr. Parkman does not seem to know that Rome, the most refined of all the ancient empires and once the mistress of the world, remarkable alike for her learning, virtue and liberty, owed all her progress and distinction to the laws of her twelve tables, whose author was a woman—laws that were implicitly obeyed by her kings, her consuls and emperors, and which are the origin of that legal code which has gone hand in hand with Christianity for 1,800 years! While the public

idea of decency in Canada and Mr. Parkman's own city is so corrupt that young men may appear in the condition of nudity upon our wharves, in presence of hundreds of passers-by, there was a fine of a thousand drachms of gold when women had political power for a like offence in Athens, and a similar penalty existed in the ancient kingdom of Lydia. "Among the Lydians and almost all the barbarians," says Herodotus, four centuries before Christ, "it is deemed a great disgrace even for a man to be seen in a state of nudity." Public morals may not have been in some of the old kingdoms equal to those of Utah and other parts of Mr. Parkman's enlightened country, but the wife of Phocian, known for her goodness and modesty, was venerated amid ancient licentiousness and applauded whenever her name happened to be mentioned in the theatre. Is it not true, My Lord, that the greatest national evils of the present day are the special enemies of woman, arising mainly from being deprived by man of every means of gaining a bare existence, and that they would immediately disappear were she clothed with political power in questions affecting her own interest? How much of the four thousand tons of tobacco now annually chewed and smoked in Canada would be consumed if women's power were recognized by the State—a large portion purchased by the poor while their wives and children are in rags, the origin of many of those nervous diseases peculiar to modern times, and the chief promoter of heart disease, which is now committing such disasters among men—even among members of the Canadian Commons—in all civilized, or, rather, tobacco-consuming, countries. How much of the whiskey which now pays four million dollars excise duty annually into our treasury—the great enemy of Canadian women—would be allowed to demoralise our people, destroy our sons, fill our country with crime and our prisons with convicts, if women had the privilege of voting for a prohibitory law? To permit no intoxicating beverages to enter Government House was certainly creditable to Lieutenant Governor Tilley—but women's political influence would prohibit it in every government house from the Atlantic to the Pacific, even in the king's chamber, where even bishops sip their wine while the temperance societies of their churches are proclaiming the untimely death of thousands—hobnobbing with governors and ministers to impress their clerical image upon the laws of the commonwealth, even to influencing legislation upon so humble a subject as marriage with a deceased wife's sister. The representative of a leading New York wine establishment, says the *Montreal Witness* (Sept. 11, 1880), declares that the action of Mrs. Hayes in refusing to place wine upon the President's table has almost destroyed the trade in the American capital, since her influence has rendered the intoxicating beverage no longer a necessity at fashionable banquets, an incident by no means illustrative of Mr. Parkman's idea of women's natural tendency to political corruption. Our political disabilities, My Lord, are the great source of our greatest evil, and, having no voice in making the laws, we are bound to obey, though—unlike ecclesiastics who seek to influence legislation, and to restrict our liberties—we contribute equally to the wealth of the nation—we are at all times exposed to the whims and decrees of the opposite sex. The judge, however delicate in person, who condemns criminals, and the minister who either executes a just sentence or refuses to accede to a culprit's wishes, is safe from personal injury, for it is a psychological law that we always fear to offend those who have the power of inflicting punishment. However wicked men may be when left to themselves they will at all times accord even justice to the innocent and to the offender. "Jeffries himself," says Junius, "when the court had no interest was an upright judge"; and the time will come when



men will confer upon women the civil power if for no other purpose than to protect from the ruffian their wives and daughters. "To take away the life of a citizen," said Polybius, two centuries before our era, "is considered a most horrid crime, and such as calls for the severest vengeance. Yet a man may openly destroy an adulterer or a robber without any fear of punishment."—(Vol. i., p. 164.) "Female captives taken by Indians," says Child, "though treated with the most diabolical cruelty, according to their savage mode of warfare, have travelled with powerful warriors days and weeks through the loneliest paths of the forest and never been subject to the slightest personal insult."—(Vol. ii, p. 232.) Among some of the ancient states, notably Epirus, should a man meet a woman in a wood or anywhere when she had lost her way and needed protection he was bound by the laws and customs of his country to retrace his steps, and conduct her to a place of safety. But while the worst of all libertines was in ancient and modern savagedom universally despised, woman's influence having ceased to be felt in political affairs, there is no such penalty for the crime in our law, and hence no one occupies more prominence than this ruffian in the British dominions. He is the dispenser of law even in our highest court of justice, stands robed within the rail, and if he has a defenceless woman for a victim revels in language that would have hanged him in Athens or Rome,—occupies a high position in military affairs, wears the insignia, if not the mitre, of St. Peter, and, having in most cases obtained his position by favour and is admitted into society without merit, so he commits iniquity without restraint and escapes without punishment. Dragged to prison at midnight for insulting the public decency, there is still no danger of exposure, for his sympathising sex, who both make and execute the laws, easily find means for suppressing his name, and rescuing him from the grasp of justice, while his female companions in guilt—though far less culpable, being in most cases the victims of political and financial oppression—not only find their names heralded through the press, but are thrown into prison as the enemies of society and of the State. But it is only the libertine that has no confidence in women. Only a Byron could say:—

"Believe a woman or an epitaph."

If you take money from the offertory—for what has happened in Toronto may happen in Ottawa—you are liable to imprisonment; if you commit perjury, at all events in these days, you are in danger of a twenty years' residence at Her Majesty's expense; but if you commit indecent assault—however frightful—upon a woman, in the eyes of Canadian law you are liable to a few dollars fine for having interfered with another man's property, as if you had injured his ox or his ass.\* But even this is preferable to the laws of the clergy, for, according to the ecclesiastical laws of England, in case of bigamy the union is merely dissolved as a nullity and without penalty!—(Bacon's Abr. vol. iii, p. 574.) The following case is an illustration: Ann Jenkinson, in the year 1777, was presented at the primary visitation of the Archbishop of York. The man who was the father of her child had promised

---

\*The following are clipped from the same column of the *Ottawa Citizen* of July 30th, 1881:—

Brantford, 29th.—J. Blackburn, the man found guilty yesterday of committing an indecent assault on a little girl, was sentenced to-day to four months in jail and 40 lashes, 20 lashes at a time.

Montreal, 29th.—Francois Malouin dit Rinfret, was sentenced to-day to four years in the penitentiary for obtaining money from the merchants here under false pretences.

Mrs. Kiely, of St. Catharine Street, Montreal, was fined \$95 and costs on Saturday for selling champagne cider without an Inland Revenue license.—*Citizen*, August, 1881.

marriage not only to herself, but before a justice, but he afterwards married another woman. The spiritual court proceeded against the poor abandoned girl, and, without even summoning her, sent her an excommunication. "Another," says Madan, "was cited on such an account, but could not take out her penance because she could not pay a certain sum of money," and of course she too was excommunicated, the men in both cases being allowed, even without a reprimand, to go free. Let our clergy make laws in Canada as they do now in England, and, though we have no Ireland to crush, we have women, and we shall soon cease to be a free people and to be worthy of our ancestors. Better by far that, like them, we should choose death to dishonour, desert a bountiful home in the sunny south for an humble cabin crowned with liberty in a northern wilderness.

GUNHILDA.

---

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

---

### A LADY'S LETTERS TO THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

"All that poetry about man being the oak and woman the vine is flat and stale and untrue. In tens of thousands of cases men who have met with commercial disaster, who have gone home discouraged, ready to give up the struggle, wishing they were dead, have found sympathy and encouragement in their wives, who have cheered and led them up to commercial prosperity." —*Talmage*.

#### LETTER VI.

MY LORD BISHOP,—The history of mankind assures us that the truly brave are the foe of superstition and the friend of woman. As only a Bellerophon could slay a Chimera, so woman may expect every consideration and protection from the true man, but only humiliation and servility from the superstitious and the coward. No words were ever more true, "none but the brave deserve the fair." France has learned the lesson that the glory of her race and the pride of her arms have passed away by the mothers of her soldiery being humiliated and enslaved by a superstitious and coward making priesthood, and that only by restoring them to their ancient place and privilege can she hope to regain her lost prestige on the banks of the Rhine. It is women that make the world, My Lord, not men! Take away all the means of self-reliance and mental development from the mother; make her bow down to laws, however unjust, which she has no voice in enacting; dry up all the channels that lead to her daily bread, except by penitent reliance on her male neighbour; preach to her from the pulpit that she is not only vile by nature, but the first and greatest enemy of God and man; browbeat her before the lion and the unicorn in our courts of justice, or rather law—a constitution weak by nature and enfeebled by unnatural abuse for fifty generations—and will her offspring be any other than timid and feeble, a hare that regards life as a race-course through a hostile territory. Is it any wonder that the burning of countless women as witches through the order of the Roman see, and the concurrence, if not connivance, of the high church clergy of England; is it any wonder that St. Bartholomew's Day, whose blood still cries from the ground, and which speaks of even greater cruelty and treachery than that of Abel, should so terrorize the nervous constitution of all womankind as to fit them to be

matrons only of sycophants and slaves, and though armed with a Martini-Henry rifle, ready to fall before a German ploughboy or the assegai of a Zulu. The victory of the priesthood, My Lord, high church and papist, is complete! England will never again fight another Crecy, Agincourt or Flodden; never again will there command a Marlborough on the banks of the Rhine, a Wellington at Waterloo or a Nelson at the Nile. A few more years of priestly rule and the British Lion—so long the terror of tyrants—will crouch at the approach of the wolf and the jackal, and a little child shall lead him; will fall to rise no more under the spear of a Ketwayo or Ayoob Khan—his carcass to be cast out with the bones of calves and crocodiles—a prey to the Bear and the Eagle. Cry ye upon the walls, oh matrons and maidens of our northern land, England the great and the good is fallen! is fallen! Upon thy lips and temples, oh! Queen of the Sea, shall grow the moss of time, as upon the eye-balls of Belus and Mars of Rome, when “a single naked fisherman shall wash his nets in the river of the ten thousand masts,” for thy laws once written with the point of a sword in the shadow of the tyrant’s throne, and by the Pitts and Bismarcks of thy godlike history, are now framed by cunning Levites and irresponsible bishops. As the priestly Aaron made a calf in Horeb as a god to the thousands of Israel, so thou hast bowed down thy neck to the gods your fathers worshipped by the northern sea.

Woman, being the weaker, is always most interested in the solidity of the state and the supremacy of its laws, and the more valiant a people the more refined, distinguished and protected their women. To her there is always safety with a Cyrus or an Alexander. “Men that are brave and generous,” says Polybius, “will face all considerations to fall before their duty.” And a brave mind alone can be an inventive one, for a bold intellect when not practising the arts of war will revel in discovery in times of peace. It was in the reign of Elizabeth, after long civil and foreign wars, and the rebellion against the Roman See, that Sir Francis Drake circumnavigated the globe, when Lord Bacon’s genius appeared, and the immortal Shakspeare, like a bright meteor, shot across our northern sky. Milton rose like a resplendent sun on the peaceful erection of the Commonwealth, only to set on the rise of the immortal Newton. It was on the expulsion of the Moors that Spain, in the person of Columbus, gave us a new world, and after the severest struggle in French history that Jacques Cartier passed up the queen of rivers and introduced to Europe a goddess more beautiful than Diana or Venus—the virgin land of this great Dominion! It was the fearless Hampdens, Pym and Cromwells, conquerors of high churchism at Naseby and Marston Moor, who peopled New England, the genius and invention of whose descendants are the wonder and pride of mankind.

Why is it, My Lord, that the United States has outstripped the Mother Country in the progress of the fine arts, in popular education, in invention and the general intelligence and elevation of the masses, all indicative of an advanced public opinion? Is it not because English legislation and public intelligence are handicapped by an antiquated House of Lords, largely due to its impracticable bishops, who, instead of looking to the future necessities of the country to justify action, are constantly looking back for precedent to Jacob, Jehosaphat and Job? “What measure of reform and justice,” said Lord Houghton in the House of Lords in May last, “have the bench of bishops in this House not resisted? That slavery has been abolished—that the people have obtained reform—that the corn laws were repealed—that an alien church in Ireland was disestablished—that the Roman Catholics and the Jews have acquired the right of citizens—so far from being due to their votes



and influence, is a result achieved against all their exertions. Which of the Reformers have they not persecuted? Which of the reforms have they not opposed?"

Why is it that the Roman Church continues Latin in its service? Is it not that the people may keep up the devotion of the ignorant ages past to secure reverence for the relics and dead bones of Rome and to insure an Italian for Pope? How soon would an ecclesiastical national policy introduce a new tongue into her rubric and stop the current of those golden rivers which have so long flowed to the commercial ruin of Catholic countries—and of England before the Reformation—into the portals of St. Peter? "And the Oriental Christians," says Mosheim "have fallen into the same fault of excessive love of antiquity; for public worship is still performed by the Egyptians in the ancient Coptic, by the Jacobites and Nestorians in Syriac, and by the Abyssinians in the ancient Ethiopic, notwithstanding all these languages have long since become obsolete and gone out of popular use."—(Vol. ii, p. 365.) The object of all this is to keep the mental current upon the past, and it is a psychological law that we always resemble those objects to which our affections and mental energies are directed. It is for this reason that Catholic countries are behind Protestant, and that the Lords of England, especially the spiritual, are as unmodern as Moses and Lysurgus, and will require only a few more years to ruin the Mother Country in the great race for political and national supremacy. Talk to them of the learned dead and of the policy of ages long past; converse about the Assyrian, Egyptian and Persian monarchies, or the Grecian and Roman commonwealths, and they answer like oracles; but speak to them of their own domestic affairs or the general wants of their own times, especially of the provinces, and on account of their inactive life, neglect of business and constant conversation with the dead, they are as vapory and ignorant as the ghost of the twelve Cæsars, and possess about as much love and respect for women. Talk to the English High Church bishops about Canada and the iniquity of the laws about to be passed in that distant and half civilized colony, where they still—even in the old provinces—send missionaries as ignorant and unpractical as themselves to convert the heathen, and they will probably speak of that great work of art, the Victoria Bridge—as did the *London Times* recently—as spanning the Mississippi River at Montreal, and of the River St. John flowing into the Georgian Bay! It is as natural, therefore, as the process of breathing for a bishop, wherever found, to press his foggy Jewish ideas and their contempt for women upon the Government of the country in which he has the doubtful happiness to live. "Jesuitry," said the *Pall Mall Gazette* a few months ago—and it might have included high churchism—"makes men whose opinions and prejudices are not of this age."

But there is one reason more cogent than all others why bishops and the clergy generally should never be permitted to in any way influence legislation with respect to women, and that is this: the *unnatural and scandalous treatment women have always personally received at their hands* whenever they chanced to fall into their power. We can at this distant day judge of the licentiousness of the clergy the immediate successors of the apostles from the circumstance that at the first Nicene Council, A.D. 325, it was enacted (canon 3) that bishops, priests and deacons should not keep women in their houses—*except their mothers and sisters*. How piously Your Lordship can talk of the danger in a wife's sister living in the family should this bill become law when the first bishops that lived so conducted themselves that no woman, excepting their own mothers and sisters, was allowed in their houses. But

what must be thought of Your Lordship's presumption when I say that so abandoned had these saints become, that the council of Mayence, in A.D. 888 decreed "that the clergy be *wholly* forbidden to have females reside in their houses; for, although there were canons allowing *certain females* (mothers and sisters) to reside in clergymen's houses, yet," says the canon, "what is greatly to be lamented, *sæpe audivimus per illam concessionem plurima scelera esse commissa ita ut quidam sacerdotum cum propriis sororibus concumbentes filios ex eis generassent*, and therefore this holy council decrees that *no female whatever* be permitted to live with them in their house." It was this conduct that caused Gregory VII to enact the laws of celibacy, for "the clergy kept women under the name of wives which they dismissed at pleasure, substituting others, and often a plurality in their place."—(Mosheim, vol. ii, p. 320.) "Severe laws," continues Mosheim, "were enacted against the scandalous conduct of the clergy, against loaning money at twelve per cent., against haunting taverns, drunkenness, concubinage and profane swearing." "Laws had to be enacted again and again," says Huth "forbidding priests to have their mothers and sisters in their houses. A tax used to be systematically levied by rulers for several centuries, which was simply a license to priests to keep concubines, and Henry III of Castile ordered that the concubines of priests should wear a piece of scarlet cloth in their head dress in order that they might be distinguishable from honest women. In the beginning of the fifth century (only three centuries after the death of the apostles) *their concubines were legalized by the council of bishops which met at Toledo*."—(Marriage of Near Kin, p. 77.) "In 1882," says Rogers (Ecc. Law. p. 107), "the bishop of Cloghern (Church of England) was deprived of his see for enormous and scandalous offences," as was the bishop of St. Davids for simony and other crimes a short time previously. Indeed it is a truth beyond denial that at this very day a large portion of the clergy, especially of the Church of England, are in favour of polygamy. Rev. J. H. Blunt, a learned and voluminous writer, and the favourite author with the high church clergy, says: "Polygamy is not *per se* an evil." This author says that "Bishop Colenso, in Africa, and missionaries of several denominations in India, allow heathen polygamists to retain their wives after baptism." In 1834 the conference of missionaries of various denominations in Calcutta, including those of the Baptist, the London and Church missionary societies of the Church of Scotland, and the American Presbyterian Board, after having had the whole subject frequently under discussion unanimously agreed on the following proposition: "If a convert, before becoming a Christian, has married more wives than one, *in accordance with the practice of the Jews and EARLY CHRISTIAN CHURCHES*, he shall be permitted to keep them all."—(Blunt.) Mormons, of course, may be received into the Church of England on the same principle. It is with the old polygamist inspiration Your Lordship argues that persons who are not consanguineously related become so by the religious ceremony of marriage. Rev. Martin Madan, the outspoken polygamist clergyman of the Church of England, says: "The phrase 'one flesh' denotes all relationship, whether of affinity or consanguinity. Whatever parties being united in God's account as man and wife, they are also one flesh; therefore it is true that a polygamist is *one flesh* with his several wives" (Thelyphthora, vol. i, p. 15),—the exact logic used by Your Lordship against marriage with a deceased wife's sister, viz., that the union is one of consanguinity!! It is this treatment of women, not by the clergy, but by some of the laity—who, however, have never equalled them in wickedness—that the bill brought before the Commons by the member for Jacques Cartier is intended to remedy, for while I write there are ten



thousand women who, having married the husband of their deceased sister—probably through ignorance of the law—have been deserted, the husband marrying again and escaping without punishment. “A case heard before Mr. Paget on Saturday at Hammersmith,” said the *London News* a few weeks ago, “shows that the existing law on the subject of marriage with a deceased wife’s sister not only interferes with the liberty of respectable people but occasionally operates to protect a scoundrel. A man named Oxeham was called upon to answer a summons for an affiliation order, and it appeared that he had gone through the form of marriage with the complainant. As, however, he had previously married her sister, who was dead, she was of course not legally his wife, and he was therefore enabled to turn her away, a privilege of which he availed himself. The magistrate could do nothing except to take the order, but the circumstance proves once more, if proof were needed, how harsh and impolitic is a legal prohibition not in accordance with the opinions and usages of society.” It was thus that Philip I of France repudiated Bertha, his queen, that Philip Augustus divorced Ingeburga of Denmark, and Henry VIII of England the good Queen Catharine. But what matters it how many hearts are broken so long as women are willing to be taught that they should especially love their greatest foes, even as the first woman’s confidant and companion was not a bishop but a serpent. Is it nothing to respectable citizens that hundreds of beautiful young women, born of such a union and fair as the sunlight from the brow of heaven, should live a lifetime under a cloud, and that our national representative and his wife should be insulted by Turks and Africans in the sublime presence of Her Majesty at the Court of St. James?

“Shall Juba’s heir reproach great Cato’s son?”

A correspondent of *The Church Guardian*, published at Halifax, has taken a novel but quite clerical method to defeat Mr. Girouard’s bill, viz., by asserting the popular belief that the issue of cousins are sure to be deformed or idiotic, leaving the reader to infer that similar misfortunes may arise from the union of such near relations as those involved in the proposed bill, begging the question, of course, that the marriage of a man with his deceased wife’s sister is a consanguineous union. This is a priestly dogma that has long done duty, but is as foolish and wicked as those that invented it. This writer does not appear to know, or knowing wishes to conceal, that the founders of the Jewish nation married cousins, of whom Moses and Jesus of Nazareth were descendants. Adam, tradition informs us, had 22 sons and 33 daughters, and if so had married his daughters. Cain, Abel and Seth married their sisters; Abraham married his half sister, but his son Isaac was deformed neither mentally nor physically. Isaac married his first cousin, and his son Jacob, the father of the twelve men whose descendants were the twelve tribes of Israel, was by no means an idiot, as his tricks with his brother Esau sufficiently prove. Among the wisest of the ancient nations were the Egyptian, Persian and Grecian, and if bodily or mental deformity be the certain result of consanguineous marriages they certainly must have been the most deformed and imbecile of all created beings. We learn from Diodorus Siculus and from Seneca that the ancient Egyptians were from the earliest times accustomed to marry their sisters. The beautiful Queen Cleopatra was the daughter of a brother and sister, great-grand-daughter of another brother and sister, and great-great-grand-daughter of Bernice, who was both cousin and sister to her husband. That such marriages were more frequent than any other may be inferred from the circumstance that Isis, the chief divinity of the old Egyptians, was sister of her husband Osiris, as Juno was both the sister and wife of Jupiter.

Zoraster, the great lawgiver of the Persians, enacted that men might marry their sisters and mothers. This is referred to by Clemens Alexandrinus, and Tertullian. "According to Sextus," says Huth, "those especially were accustomed to marry their mothers who were considered the wisest of their race, viz., the magicians." The fathers of the wise men who saw the star at the Saviour's birth were no doubt their brothers. "Zoraster recommends above all other alliances those between first cousins as marriages deserving the reward of heaven."—(Huth's *Marriage of Near Kin*.) St. Jerome informs us that the Medes, Indians, Persians and Ethiopians were accustomed to marry their mothers, daughters and grand-daughters, and Justin Martyr says that the Phœnicians married their sisters. The Greeks from the earliest times married their sisters, as appears from Homer :—

"Six blooming youths in private grandeur bred,  
And six fair daughters, graced the royal bed.  
These sons their sisters wed, and all remain  
Their parents' pride and pleasure of their reign."

—(Odyssey, b. x., 1-8.)

But the Halifax correspondent did not know perhaps that the righteous Lot married his daughters, that Abraham's brother Nahor married his niece, that Moses' mother was his father's aunt, and that Zelophehad's five daughters were according to the law of Moses obliged to marry their cousins.—(See Num. xxvii, 1-11; Ruth iii, 12; 1st Chron. xxiii, 22.) In the year A.D. 446, when, according to Your Lordship, the Ancient Church of England existed in all its fruition, Vortigern, king of the South Britains, married his own daughter. "There is no doubt," says Huth, "that the marriage of first cousins was always permitted by Roman law." The Emperor Theodosius, A.D. 390, was the first to prohibit such marriages. St. Athanasius and St. Augustine, through whom Your Lordship claims descent from the Apostle John, declare that "marriage between first cousins is neither against the law of God or man." By English civil law, Statute 32 Henry VIII, c. 38, cousins are allowed to marry, but by the canon law the marriage of both first and second cousins is prohibited. If marriage under this bill, should it become law, will irritate the sensitive conscience of the clergy, by what ecclesiastical canon does it happen that they have without any conscientious qualms continued to marry first and second cousins since the times of the Reformation, when such unions have always been held incestuous by Church of England canon law? And in celebrating these marriages they have not only violated the laws of the church, but, in many cases, have broken the statutes of the kingdom, and made themselves liable to transportation. "The 62nd of the canons of 1603," says Rogers, "enjoins marriage to be solemnized between the hours of eight and twelve in the forenoon. The 4 Geo. IV, c. lxxvi, by-s. 21, enacts that any clergyman celebrating marriage at any other hour than between eight and twelve shall be liable to be transported for fourteen years. The same hour is still specified in the civil law of England. But Your Lordship will reply that the clergy would not and did not perform such marriages without the consent of the church. That is the point. Those persons were obliged to obtain a dispensation—and to pay for it—the same as Roman Catholics do from the Pope, and this has been for two centuries a fruitful source of income to the Church of England. "Marriage by a special license" says an English author, "enables the contracting parties to be married at any time or place. This costs about thirty pounds, and can only be obtained by application to the archbishop of the province."—(Modern

Etiquette, p. 79.) If the English clergy in this country be permitted to shape legislation they may be as successful as in the Mother Country, where, according to civil law, illegitimate children may become legitimate, and can inherit through a dispensation from a bishop.

Shadowy indeed must be modern jurisprudence and the consciousness of human justice when a Protestant bishop is permitted in the lobby of the Canadian Senate to defeat an humble measure intended to relieve the restrictions upon a small proportion of Canadian women, when we are absolutely debarred from the civil service of our own country, from the privilege of holding any respectable, not to say lucrative, position in the gift of the Crown. Never, My Lord, since the Reformation, did the fate of civilization in Europe and America so quiver in the balance as at this moment, when Ritualism,\* in the spangle of refinement and the guise of Protestantism, seeks to enlist the sympathies of the better classes, especially the women, having for its object not only the control of parliaments but of the executive itself. Are you not aware, My Lord, that the dial of human progress was swept backward a thousand years by Christian bishops seizing on the powers of temporal princes, which entailed national and moral ruin upon the grandest and proudest nation that ever had ennobled the graces and virtues of mankind? Before the age of Constantine when *dulce est pro patria mori*,† was the national sentiment, it was the boast as well as the protection of the subject of the Cæsars to say: "I am a Roman citizen"; but the subject who could quell the Gaul and the German under Caius Julius Cæsar easily fell a prey to the Goth and the Hun, when he came to be taught by the Christian bishop that there was no virtue in love of country, and that he should yield his allegiance to a spiritual rather than to a temporal prince. Gibbon having said that Christianity caused the fall of the Roman Empire, his critics, no doubt as conscientious, if not as orthodox, as Your Lordship, added the following note: "Gibbon has here laid open the true cause which produced the fall of the Roman Empire and the dark ages that followed. But he has not traced its workings distinctly. M. Schreiter has justly accused him of confounding Christianity with its hierarchy, and ascribing to the former evils which are strictly attributable only to the latter. The mischief originated in the abuse which ingrafted on Christianity a powerful, ambitious and imperious priesthood."—(Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. ii, pp. 374-5.) It was at this period woman's power had risen to an eminence greater than it had ever attained in the history of the world, and as her influence was used by the high church bishops, in the reign of the Stuarts, to erect the papacy in England, which resulted in the political destruction of Englishwomen, so her sympathies, which have ever induced her to surrender her wealth to the church, bore the spiritual power to the throne of the Roman Empire, which resulted not only in her own moral and political degradation, but well nigh in the extinction of the social and political liberties of the human race.

The influence of religion upon woman, for reasons unnecessary to explain, is always more potent than with men, and will always render her more subservient to the ecclesiastical power. The cry of pain arouses her anguish, so ready to respond to the cry of her child; the stroke of affliction in her family, or the loss of fortune, bows her down at the religious shrine, so that in all ages the influence of a religion that appeals to the sympathies, as does

---

\*The three Roman Catholic cardinals who attended the funeral of the late Dean Stanley had once been Church of England clergymen.

†It is sweet to die for one's native country.



the Christian, has been liable to endanger her mental independence and personal freedom; and as, from her physical nature, she must always, to a certain degree, be debarred from the same activity as man in framing the laws, it doubly becomes the duty of the latter to see that she is neither oppressed by designing ecclesiastics nor by the statutes of the commonwealth. The people of Canada, especially the members of the Church of England, are content to direct their prayers to heaven over the throne whose base is washed by the other side of the sea, that our national and religious sympathies should blend with those of the land that gave us birth, receiving in exchange that higher civilization and refinement which shine from beneath the golden gates of the rising sun, in the same way that half savage England, in return for the blood and treasure consumed in carrying the Cross on the plains of Palestine, received from her returning armies a taste for eastern refinement, and for the arts of the Greek and Roman world. But, while this is true, the leading women of Canada are not willing, without protest, either that their less intelligent sisters who know nothing of the intrigues of a court or the plottings of a bishop, should be influenced by the priesthood to petition against a measure intended to remove a mortifying personal disability, or that a prelate, who has never in his ideas risen above the age of feudalism, should seek to continue a galling religious code that originated in the twilight of the dark ages. Never, My Lord, has there existed in the history of this country such a feeling as to British connection as since the period when Your Lordship, a bishop of the National Church, presumed to enter the sacred precincts of the Canadian Executive to influence legislation against an humble class of Her Majesty's Canadian subjects—an act which may prove a crime against the Mother Land, by casting into the balances of Fortune the fate of an empire. Were I not a daughter of Eve I would beseech Your Lordship to descend from your political Carmel, for, lo! there is "a man's hand" on the western sky.

GUNHILDA.

---

## MARRIAGE WITH A DECEASED WIFE'S SISTER.

---

A LADY'S LETTERS TO THE BISHOP OF ONTARIO.

"It is doubtful if freedom could long be sustained in a country where anonymous writing is prohibited."—*Encyclopædia Britannica*.

### LETTER VII.

MY LORD BISHOP,—From the times of the Reformation to the present there have been two parties among the clergy of the Church of England, the Roman Catholic, or—which is perhaps a better term—the Papal Catholic, and the Protestant; in other words, the high church and the low church. The former included, and still includes, with some exception, the bishops, both outside and within the House of Lords, and who have ever been a clog to the wheels of legislation in England. It was they who were the first to rush to the aid of Mary, who subsequently, and mainly by their advice, deluged the kingdom in blood; were the firm adherents of the Roman Catholic Charles I, of the Jesuit James II, and the most treacherous foes of William III, Prince of Orange. For several centuries after the Reformation they continued the worship of the Virgin, and up to the times of Elizabeth the public worship of images. In 1547 Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester, said that "he thought the removing of images was on design to subvert religion and the state of the



world."—(Burnet's History Ref. vol. ii, p. 11.) Up to the year 1551, in the reign of Edward VI, the oath of the king's supremacy taken by the bishops closed with these words: "So help me God by all the saints and the holy evangelists."—(Blunt.) The doctrine of transubstantiation was then, as it is now, as much the belief of the high church clergy as of Rome. "That the body and blood of Christ exist in the elements of bread and wine," says Blunt, "is as much the belief of the English Church as of the Latin and Greek Churches."

To show how completely the bishops of the Church of Rome in England ground down the people, we are informed that in the age immediately before the Reformation the laity received the Holy Communion only in one kind, that is, the consecrated bread. The Council of Constance (A.D. 1415) gave a law to withhold the consecrated wine altogether from the laity—subsequently teaching that if the people stood and *saw* others partake of the Communion it had the same effect as if they took it themselves" (His. Ref. pp. 33-35),—the wine, of course, being kept for the clergy. A high church clergyman once contended with me that this taking of the wine wholly by the priest is perfectly proper and scriptural, for Christ said to his disciples—that is those who were to preach the gospel—"Drink ye *all* of it—(Matt. xxvi, 27)—meaning no one but the clergy should partake of it! Imagine his surprise, however, when I pointed out to him in his Greek Testament that "*all*" refers *not* to the wine but to the *disciples*, for the Greek word is not in the accusative case but in the nominative plural!

Mr. Blunt further says: "So grossly had the custom of appointing bishops *who did not reside in the country* extend that when Archbishop Longham made inquiry respecting the pluralist clergy of the Province of Canterbury some were found who held as many as twenty benefices and dignitaries. These were mostly Italians." But will you believe me, My Lord, that, when the House of Commons in Elizabeth's reign brought in a bill to remedy this monstrous evil Archbishop Whitgift wrote a letter to Her Majesty bewailing the wickedness of the times and declaring that the Church of England would be ruined should this bill become law!—(Fuller's Church History.) "The woful and distressed state in which we are like to fall," says His Grace, "forceth us, with grief of heart, in most humble mien to crave Your Majesty's most sovereign protection. We, therefore, not as directors, but as humble remembrancers, beseech Your Highness's favourable beholding of our present state and what it will be in time if the bill against pluralities should take place." The same Parliament afterwards brought down a bill giving liberty to marry, not merely as formerly, in Lent, but at all times of the year, without restraint. Again is the Archbishop in terror, and again he prays at the feet of the Queen that this bill, which will pauperize the clergy, may not pass, but pass it did, notwithstanding. The difficulty in the former case was that the bishops held each several benefices from which they drew immense sums every year; and in the second they had always received large sums for dispensations, similar to those now granted by the Pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury, giving liberty to individuals to marry in Lent, and of course this source of revenue would no longer exist on the passing of the bill. In Your Lordship's letter to the *Ottawa Citizen* (March 24th, 1880) you used the following—and, as usual, ungrammatical—expression: "While I am amazed that any man should avow that he married his brother's wife, yet Mr. Lantier's letter corroborates my statement that the proposed bill is one to facilitate the sale of indulgences and dispensations." This, My Lord, is insolence and assurance combined, for

surely Your Lordship must know that while Canadian legislation could not interfere with the canons of the Roman Church, for several hundred years similar dispensations were granted—as I have just shown—by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and are to this day. “The Archbishop of Canterbury,” says Rees, “has a power by statute, 25 Henry VIII, c. 21, of dispensing in any case within the realm wherein dispensations not contrary to the law of God were formerly granted by the See of Rome, as well to the king as to his subjects. Every bishop of common right has the power of dispensing in common cases.” In the history of the Protestant church, with the exception, perhaps, of the Burial’s Bill, no legislation to restrict the ecclesiastical power has ever been more vigorously resisted by the bishops than that which sought to prevent this lucrative sale of indulgences by the archbishops and bishops of the English church. You say “Mr. Lantier gave £100 for a dispensation from the Pope to marry his brother’s wife,” and ask—“What is a poor man to do?” I answer Your Lordship’s question by asking another—“What is a poor *woman* to do?” I have already cited an instance—and that only one out of thousands—of a poor woman having been excommunicated, so late as the reign of George III, because she had not money enough to buy the pardon of the English bishops! The famous Alsop in his *Melius Inquirendum*, referring to this conduct of Archbishop Whitgift, says, “no reformation in the marriage law can be made but what will notably diminish the revenues, grandeur and credit of the church, and that, whatever have been the *specious* pretensions, this has been the *real* obstruction to effectual reformation. Kings and parliaments have always been inclinable towards a redress of exorbitances, but the covetousness and pride of churchmen have ever impeded their pious endeavours.”—(p. 68.)

The table of degrees, which seems the special object of veneration by Your Lordship and the Metropolitan of Canada, was made out from the Roman Catholic table by Archbishop Parker and Bishop Jewel, both of whom not only believed in women being witches, but were foremost in preparing the public to enact the most horrible butchery and murder of women in England that has ever been known since Englishwomen began to be. This table was confirmed by a convocation of Bishops in 1563, one of the leading spirits being this same Archbishop Whitgift who so zealously contended for papal supremacy in the Church of England. In our Book of Common Prayer the heading is “A table of kindred and affinity wherein whosoever are related are forbidden in Scripture and our laws to marry together.” This is a falsehood to begin with; for, while this table forbids marriage between uncles and nieces the Scriptures do not *anywhere* forbid such marriages. “Moses nowhere,” says Huth, “prohibits the marriage of an uncle and a niece. Indeed we have an instance of such a marriage in Othneil, the younger brother of Caleb, the spy, who married Achsah, his niece and the daughter of Caleb.”—(Josh. xv, 17.) In your petition to Parliament you say, “Any infringement of the Table of Affinity must inevitably lead to the abolition of the whole code, so that a man may marry his wife’s mother or his wife’s daughter.” The Pope might have said the same thing to the English Reformers. But this is not as bad as marrying his half sister, as did Abraham, or his daughters, as did pious Lot, or murdering a husband to get his wife, as did David, or marrying three hundred wives, as did Solomon. According to Moses, if the mother is not related to the child, there is no harm, even in an ecclesiastical view, for a man to marry his wife’s daughter if he be not her father. But the Table of Affinity *has* been remodelled scores of times by the church and has been so since the Reformation, and yet no attempt has been made to

commit the immorality of which Your Lordship speaks. Moreover, though marriage with a deceased wife's sister was forbidden by ecclesiastical law, but admitted by the civil, before the Marriage Act of 1835 (5 and 6 William IV), yet the Church of England bishops in the House of Lords, in order to prevent by civil enactment such marriages in future, *actually voted to legalize those that had been consummated* before the passage of this Act. "Of this conduct of the bishops," said Lord Houghton in the House of Lords in May last, "no explanation has ever been given which exonerates them from a charge of the grossest inconsistency. Professing to believe that marriage with a deceased wife's sister was unlawful and incestuous, only one course was open to them, and that was to refuse on any grounds and for any reasons to assist in giving them legal sanction. Instead of pursuing this plain and intelligible course, they condoned all the sins of the past and consented to bless the incestuous couples who had been married before the 31st August, 1835." If the Scriptures do forbid marriage with a deceased wife's sister, then their Lordships voted to legalize what they knew God had expressly forbidden. Cease, therefore, My Lord, bewailing the iniquity of the Canadian Commons for voting to legalize marriage with a deceased wife's sister, when they were but imitating the highest ecclesiastical authority in the United Kingdom. But are you aware that marriage with a deceased wife's sister was permitted by Christ and His apostles and by the Christian church during the first three centuries of its history? "Constantine forbade marriage with a sister-in-law," says Huth, "*but it was permitted up to his time*." The prohibition was renewed by Valentinian, Theodosius and Arcadius, but Justinian does not seem to have noticed it."—(Marriage of Near Kin, p. 42.) On what authority, therefore, did Your Lordship presume to use the following language in your petition to the Commons: "The Church, for one thousand four hundred years after Christ, held that a man's wife's sister becomes his own sister!" The first Council of Bishops, that forbade marriage with a deceased wife's sister, also forbade marriage with bridesmaids, a wife's god-daughter or god-child, and first imposed celibacy upon the clergy! For twelve hundred years the church has forbidden *bishops* to marry, and yet Your Lordship has contravened the plain doctrine of the church, according to your *own* showing, by taking a wife! "Marriage with a deceased wife's sister," says Lange in his Commentary, "is clearly allowable under the Levitical law, not merely by *not being prohibited*, but, being prohibited during the lifetime of the sister first taken to wife, it becomes doubly certain that it was permitted afterwards."

To deceive the Canadian Commons, Your Lordship and the clergy generally pretend to have surrendered the scriptural argument, while during the last year, to secure the sympathy and signature of church women, the church journals have been flooded with anonymous correspondence, evidently by clergymen, arguing that Moses forbids marriage with a deceased wife's sister! In your letter to the *Ottawa Citizen*, March 22nd, 1880, Your Lordship says, speaking of Leviticus xviii, 18: "I knew that the Hebrew is capable of six different interpretations, all, however, tending to forbid marriage with a deceased wife's sister." Here I must claim Your Lordship's indulgence, but I affirm that you cannot summon a respectable author—not six, My Lord, but *one*—who does interpret this passage to forbid marriage with a deceased wife's sister!!! I have searched all the great authorities, Jewish and Christian, and they all affirm that such a marriage *was lawful under the Levitical code*. All Jewish authors support the position I have assumed. The Targum of Onkelos, the



oldest and best of the Jewish commentaries, and which was read in the synagogue, says plainly that this is the meaning of the passage, for it translates it—“And a woman, with her sister, thou shalt not take, to afflict her *in her lifetime*.” The Syriac version, made in the second century, says the same; so the translation made from the original Hebrew by St. Jerome. Philo the Jew, who wrote in the time of Christ, says this passage refers simply to *two sisters living at the same time*, and does not even hint that any other construction or interpretation had ever been suggested. In the Pentateuch “*newly translated* (into English) *under the supervision of the Rev. the Chief Rabbi of the United Congregations of the British Empire*,” the passage is translated thus—“Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her *in her lifetime*.” Dr. Alder, the Chief Rabbi of the Jews in the United Kingdom, says, in his evidence before the Royal Commissioners: “Marriage with a deceased wife’s sister is not only not considered as prohibited, but it is distinctly understood to be permitted; and on this point neither the Divine Law, nor the rabbis, nor historical Judaism, leaves room for the least doubt. I can only reiterate my former assertions, that all sophistry must be split on the clear and unequivocal words (Lev. xviii, 18) *in her lifetime*.” In this he was supported by every rabbi in the Kingdom, by the whole Jewish press, and by every Jew in the British Parliament. The Septuagint, or Greek version, translated from the Hebrew text nearly three hundred years before Christ, gives a similar sense. This is the Bible that was publicly read in the synagogue for nearly three centuries! Our Saviour and the apostles read and quoted it more than any other, and, excepting the Syriac, *it was for several centuries the only translation used in the church*; nor is any other used in the Greek Church to this day! The passage in dispute is thus translated from the Septuagint by Sir Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton: “Thou shalt not take a wife in addition to her sister as a rival to her \* \* \* *while she is yet living*.” Cranmer, believing with high churchmen of the present day that the church is higher authority than the Bible, did not scruple to give the correct translation. This passage, in Cranmer’s Bible of 1540 reads thus: “Thou shalt not take a woman and her sister *also* to vex her *as long as she lives*.” In the revision of Cranmer’s Bible by Cuthbert, Bishop of Durham and Ridley, in 1541, the same translation is retained.

But Jewish law, like all others, is only followed by the bishops when it answers best for the moment the political exigencies of the church. As a noted example, Your Lordship exonerates King Henry VIII for divorcing his wife, Queen Catharine, with whom he had lived happily for twenty years, on the plea that she had been his brother Arthur’s wife, when, if the law, as laid down in Leviticus, and of which Your Lordship and the *Dominion Churchman* are such admirers, is to be followed, he was in reality bound to marry her, for Arthur had died childless! In your letter of March 22nd you say: “Moses allowed marriage of a man with his deceased brother’s wife *in one special case*, that is, when tribal inheritance was involved.” But, to use Your Lordship’s words in that same letter, “a thing is morally right or morally wrong, and why should a dispensation be given to anyone to commit a moral wrong?” I ask “Why?” also, and the answer must be, that Moses gave the dispensation because it was morally right for a man to marry his brother’s wife. If not, then you defeat yourself, for if Moses gave a dispensation to commit a moral wrong, then there is no reason why that precedent should not be followed by the Pope of Rome; and Mr. Lantier was perfectly right to ask for the dispensation, and Your Lordship was perfectly wrong—

Moses being judge—in reproving the Pope for granting it. We should never have had any difficulty with this prohibition—for even Bishop Jewel was opposed to it—had it not been for Thomas Cranmer, for “the prohibition in the Table of Affinity to legalize marriage with a deceased wife’s sister,” says Dr. Pusey, “passed, as is known, *by Cranmer’s advice*.” It is evident, however, that Your Lordship is in an inextricable difficulty, a difficulty as perplexing as that of Cardinal Wolsey when he had to please both the King and the Pope, and Your Lordship’s fate may be as lamentable as his. If you say Henry VIII did right in divorcing Catharine, you offend Moses (Mark xii, 19) and make Queen Mary, her daughter, who for several years was head of the English Church, illegitimate. If you say he did wrong, you make Queen Elizabeth illegitimate, the ground on which the Pope urged the claims of Mary Stuart to the English throne.

But there is another consideration, which shows most clearly that the laws of marriage among the Jews were simply for the civil welfare of their own state, and were never intended, either in a moral or civil sense, to be binding beyond it. Your Lordship says Moses permitted a man to marry his brother’s wife for reasons of state, and so did he permit polygamy on the same principle. St. Augustine says: “*Quoniam multiplicandae posteritatis causa plures uxores lex nulla prohibebat*” (Because, for the sake of multiplying posterity, no law forbade many wives). Bishop Burnet, chaplain to Queen Anne, says: “Polygamy was made, in some cases, a duty by Moses’ law.” Martin Luther says: “The Mosaic law concerning the wife of a deceased brother and a daughter defiled against the father’s consent, are well known, which *compel* a man to have a plurality of wives.” To this Your Lordship assents, for you say “under the Mosaic law a man might have many wives.” Was the marriage law, therefore, which he laid down intended to be binding beyond his own state or not? If not, then we are not governed by it; if so, then Mormonism is right and polygamy should be the law in Canada; and when Christ said to his disciples “henceforth ye shall catch men,” he meant “it will be your chief business henceforth,” as it seems always to have been with the clergy, especially with the bishops “to catch women.” The Metropolitan, in his address before the Provincial Synod at Montreal a few months ago, said that “we are under the law to Christ.” The Rev. Mr. Madan, a clergyman of our own church, was right when he urged the doctrine believed in by many high church clergymen and apparently by the Metropolitan, that polygamy *ought* to be the law in the British dominions. Paul, however, held a decidedly different opinion, for he says, “we are no longer under the law, but under *grace*; the law was our schoolmaster to bring us to Christ.” St. Basil, Bishop of Caesarea (A.D. 340) says the marriage laws of Moses are no more binding in the Christian Church than circumcision or other ceremonial rites. “Whatever the law saith,” says St. Basil, “it says to them that are under the law, else by parity of reasoning circumcision and the sabbath and abstinence from meats might be urged upon us.” But Your Lordship has surrendered the whole argument. To avoid the responsibility of encouraging divorce, which Moses in many cases permitted, you say his marriage law is no longer binding!! Your words are “Moses allowed the Jews to put away their wives, but the Great Reformer *restored the primeval law of marriage as we have it in Genesis ii, 24!!*”

But with high churchmen and Roman Catholics it is not what the scriptures teach—having forged a large portion of them—that decides questions ecclesiastical, but what the *church* teaches; and this is plainly the secret

belief of Your Lordship. In your petition to Parliament, before citing the evidence of Holy Scripture, you urge at first the *ecclesiastical* evidence: "the *Church of England* in Provincial Synod assembled in the year 1877, solemnly re-enacted the *table of affinity*," giving your *biblical* evidence as your *second* clause. This is the doctrine of Rev. Bedford Jones, rector of St. Albans, Ottawa, a clergyman who is a Roman Catholic priest except in name. His words are: "The Holy Scriptures in the hands of God's ministers are the divinely ordained means of making men *wise* unto salvation. The scriptures *are no means* of salvation."—(*Ottawa Citizen*, August 17th, 1880.) That is, the ordained clergy—in other words the church—are higher than the scriptures, and the latter only mean what the church says they do. One of the articles in the famous creed of Pope Pius IV is: "I do admit the Holy Scriptures in the same sense that Holy Mother Church doth, whose business it is to judge of the true sense and interpretation of them." One of the papal canon laws is: "*Omnia quae nunc apud nos est scripturae auctoritas ab ecclesiae auctoritate necessario dependet*," that is: "all the authority which we attribute to the scriptures necessarily depends on the authority of the church." Eccius maintains that "*ecclesiam esse scripturis antiquiorem et scripturam non esse authenticam nisi ecclesiae auctoritate*," (the church is more ancient than the scriptures, and the scriptures are not authentic, save by the authority of the church). Hon. John Bright, in his speech in the English House of Commons, April 21st, 1867, said "so far as the Catholic Church is concerned they feel it a grievance that in this country the law is as it is; because under it the dispensations of their church have no effect." The Roman Catholics are willing the bill should pass, because the authority for marriage is not in the Bible, but in the church, and dispensations will be as necessary in the eye of the Sovereign Pontiff as they are now, and Your Lordship is opposed to it—not because Moses forbids it—which he does not—but because the church, which is higher than Moses, has subscribed to a certain table of affinity, which originated *not* in the Bible, but in the Roman Church and a council of colonial bishops. In order, however, to catch the support of Protestant dissenters in the Commons you state, My Lord, in your petition—in that contradictory logic which has made you famous—that "the Holy Scriptures plainly forbid such marriages," and you appeal to Leviticus for proof!! But while you are unwilling to judge as to what is right and wrong from the experience of modern society, but must subject our rule of life to Moses, why have you stumbled on a mite when a monstrous system of iniquity—first introduced by Christian bishops, and which is condemned by Moses—exists in your own city as well as every other on the continent—to women a sea of sorrow that has no shore and a crime against our sex that reaches to heaven, threatening the moral and physical destruction, not only of youth, but of the human race. How piously Your Lordship can talk of the Christian hand of England that is staying the African slave trade—which, however, first introduced it in the person of Sir John Hawkins—but who ever heard of an English bishop, except the son of the great Wilberforce, of abolition memory, either within or without the House of Lords, ever referring to the thousands of beautiful Georgian and Circassian women that are hourly abducted and sold under the rod of the auctioneer to the beasts of Constantinople, when not a night passes there are not sacks thrown into the Bosphorus containing the mutilated, worn out, and murdered bodies of those once beautiful women. This trade Russia called piracy, but her attempts to destroy it were frustrated by the holders of Turkish bonds, and the Shylocks of London, whose influence was sufficient to send Her Majesty's fleet into the



Ægean Sea. Little did the British soldier know when freezing in the trenches before Sebastopol and breathing out his brave life on the red fields of Alma and of Inkerman that he was fighting in the cause of the Great Red Dragon, born under the throne of Christianity and Judaism, and which feeds and lives upon the beauty, virtue and blood of modern women. Did the lords spiritual, though their blood cried to them from the ground, ever press the magnitude of this iniquity upon the attention of Her Majesty's Government? Not once. Nor has Your Lordship ever declared from the pulpit that hundreds and thousands of young Canadian women are annually waylaid and kidnapped\* to lead a life of shame more horrible than death, even to crucifixion with the wormwood and the gall.

But why did you not attack Sir John Macdonald for asking an appropriation to take the census in 1881? for this is plainly forbidden in scripture (1 Chron., xxi, 1). Why did you not reprove him for legislating to legalize a certain percentage in usury? for Moses, in this same book of Leviticus, says: "Thou shalt not give thy brother thy money upon usury! nor lend him thy victuals for increase."—(Levit. xxv, 37.) Is there a church in Your Lordship's diocese that is not five times more expensive than people can afford, and in which we are dunned the annual round for money to pay interest on mortgages? Why did you not excommunicate the Minister of the Interior for selling, and Hon. Edward Blake for advising to sell, the lands of the North-West? for Moses says, "The land shall not be sold forever, for the land is mine."—(Levit. xxv, 20.) There are bishops in the Church of England who are fond of blood pudding, but this diet is strictly forbidden by Moses!—(Levit. xvii, 12.) In Levit. xxi, 5, it is written: "Thou shalt not shave off the corner of thy beard!" Moses says, "neither shall a garment mingled of linen and woollen come upon thee" (Levi xix, 19); for this ancient National Policy lawgiver, like the enlightened legislators of modern days, did not wish to see the money sent out of his own country to purchase the linen of Egypt. But even this plain Mosaic command you were never known to respect, for although Your Lordship is fond of attending National Policy banquets you have ever contended for the use of the linen surplice in the Church of England. Moses says: "The seventh year shall be a sabbath of rest unto the land; thou shalt neither sow thy seed nor prune thy vineyard."—(Lev. xxv, 27.) Did you ever attempt to show the ministry what a blissful thing it would be—enjoined upon them by Moses!—to introduce the sabbatical year into Canada? "Every fiftieth year shall be a year of jubilee."—(ch. xxv, 11.) Have you ever sought to obtain for this country a year of jubilee? Moses says: "Remember the sabbath day (Saturday) to keep it holy," and yet this day is not held as sacred with the Church of England. Nay, let me ask, My Lord, while I bid you adieu, does the church now to promote its ends resort less to disreputable cunning and fraud than in the days of Synesius, who declared that "lies and fiction are useful to the people?" Do the clergy aim less to captivate, pillage and humiliate women than in the first ages of Christianity, when they robbed them at the confessional, discouraged marriage, legalized polygamy, and in consequence of scandalous misdemeanours were forbidden by the chief magistrate even to enter the houses of widows and virgins, the em-

---

\*A villain who is supposed by the police to have been connected with the ruin for purposes of prostitution of one or two hundred girls, is, on conviction in one case, sentenced to six months' imprisonment and a fine of one hundred dollars.—*Montreal Witness*, July, 1881.

peror himself threatening their disobedience with the animadversion of the civil judge? Are bishops more honourable in their private life than was Judah, or David, or Solomon, or Paul Bishop of Antioch, who had several wives, or even St. Augustine—less worthy of being classed as money-sharks and winebibbers, friends of publicans and sinners,—than were the first successors of the apostles? These are questions Your Lordship will not answer. Nor is it necessary. Your appearance, My Lord, in the lobby of the Senate to secure the defeat of Mr. Girouard's bill, and the uniform tenor of your past career, are an answer to them all.

GUNHILDA.

---

